DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 371 326 CS 011 755

AUTHOR Newman, Anabel; And Others
TITLE CONSULT-I Reading. Cincinnati Project. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Indiana Univ., Bloomington. Reading Practicum Center.
SPONS AGENCY Cincinnati Public Schools, Ohio.
PUB DATE 30 Jun 93
NOTE 94p.; For related documents, see CS 011 754-758.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Computer Assisted Instruction; Elementary Education; *Individualized Instruction; *Instructional Effectiveness; *Reading Achievement; *Reading Diagnosis; Reading Difficulties; *Reading Improvement; Reading Programs; Reading Research; Remedial Reading
IDENTIFIERS African Americans; Cincinnati Public Schools OH; *CONSULT I Computer Program

ABSTRACT

A study examined the effectiveness of the spring-semester 1993 implementation of the CONSULT-I(R) program, which uses artificial intelligence with statistical pattern recognition in constructing a diagnosis and recommending treatment of reading difficulties. Eight classroom teachers and two Gifted and Talented coordinators at South Avondale Elementary School, Cincinnati, Ohio, volunteered to participate in the project. Participants were trained in collecting data for a learner profile, implementing the strategies recommended by the CONSULT-I program, and assessing the 43 Afro-American students at the end of the semester. Results indicated that: (1) 85% of the learners had positive changes in affect and 89% had positive changes in attitude; (2) 80% of the students became better readers; and (3) the revelation that working with a learner's interest can make a great difference in the success of a child was of paramount importance to teachers. Recommendations include: start the program at the beginning of the school year; clarify the explanation of the anecdotal records; provide extra time for recordkeeping; and encourage further parent participation. (Contains nine references and nine tables of data. Appendixes present the taxonomy of learner characteristics, results of three earlier studies, inservice agendas, an anecdotal record form, questionnaires, success criteria, and a tabulation of program assessment.) (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 371 326

CONSULT-I® READING

CINCINNATI PROJECT

FINAL REPORT

JUNE 30, 1993

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
A. Newman
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Anabel Newman
Elizabeth Metz
Indiana University
Reading Practicum Center
Bloomington, Indiana

Edward Patrick
Patrick Consult Inc.
Cincinnati, Ohio

CS011252

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CONSULT-I® Reading Cincinnati Project

Spring Semester 1993

Table of Contents

Table of Contents i

Table of Tables ii

Acknowledgments iii

Background 1

Introduction 5

Participants 5

Methodology 5

Procedures 6

Findings 8

- Program 8
- Learner 17
- Data Analysis 22

Discussion 22

Recommendations 24

Conclusions 28

References 30

Appendices 31

Table of Tables

Table 1: Teacher Responses to Original Goals Statement . 15

Table 2: Criteria and Examples for Changes in Affect . . 18

Table 3: Criteria and Examples for Changes in Attitude . 18

Table 4: Criteria for Success 19

Table 5: Affect, Attitude, Success 19

Table 6: Changes in Affect by Grade Level 20

Table 7: Changes in Attitude by Grade Level 20

Table 8: Changes in Success by Grade Level 21

Table 9: Changes in Self-Concept by Grade Level 21

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to many who have made this project possible.

To Katharine Ware, Assistant Superintendent of Cincinnati Public Schools, whose initial interest in the results of the 1991-92 Ohio Project encouraged us to press forward.

To Dr. Zulphi Ahmad, Director, Urban Demonstration Projects in Cincinnati, for his assistance in working out the midyear arrangements to work with the South Avondale Elementary School, and for his continuing interest in the potential of CONSULT-I® Reading to benefit children.

To Mrs. Rose Jenkins, Principal, South Avondale Elementary School, for her patience in working with us to arrange the inservice meetings, and for her vision of every child as gifted.

For the Gifted and Talented Coordinators at South Avondale, Marilyn Todd and Alice Callier, who shared time and space in arranging the inservice meetings in pleasant surroundings and assisting with the many details on site.

For the South Avondale teachers who participated in the project. Their receptivity, diligence, enthusiasm, and good works made out visits to Cincinnati a pleasure and the outcomes of their instruction have filled this report with encouraging news for the beleaguered urban teacher.

For the office staff at South Avondale who cheerfully located whomever we needed for the appointed Tuesday afternoon calls.

And finally, to Representative William Mallory, whose initial vision early in 1991 helped us launch the Ohio projects.

In Indiana

To the Indiana University faculty and staff members who provide support for these kinds of efforts, especially Jan Ryser, in our School of Education, for early assistance with the proposal and for the Contract Administration Office for the dispatch and care with which they process the various steps in the development.

And to our department chair, Dr. Larry Mikulecky, for support and suggestions as the project went forward.

Anabel Newman
Elizabeth Metz
Edward Patrick

CONSULT-I (R) READING CINCINNATI PROJECT

SPRING SEMESTER 1993

FINAL REPORT

Background

In 1983 the Reading Practicum Center of Indiana University was offered a unique opportunity to develop a subsystem involving learners with reading difficulties for CONSULT-I®, a computer program designed by Edward Patrick, M.D. Ph.D. and James Fattu, M.D. Ph.D. with the capability of matching individual learners with instructional strategies that would be the most likely to bring about success.

A pilot study using Outcome Advisor®, a component of CONSULT-I®, was conducted to determine the potential of the program in education. The results, which showed Outcome Advisor® a slightly better predictor than experts in the field, justified further exploration.

The staff of the Reading Practicum Center (RPC) had observed through the years that changes in affect, attitude, and success usually occurred before changes in standardized test scores and are often more significant in indicating the emotional and intellectual growth of the individual. Therefore, it was decided to use these criteria as indicators of learner progress. Descriptions of these changes were taken from case studies and categorized into high, medium, and low.

A taxonomy of learner characteristics which were thought to have an impact on success in learning to read was developed by the RPC staff (Appendix A). The original taxonomy contained 94 features with each feature having four to nine values. Over several years this taxonomy was refined to 20 features which actually discriminated between those learners having success and those who did not. The information required by the taxonomy was entered for 218 learners.

A final step in developing the reading subsystem, CONSULT-I® Reading, was to determine which instructional strategy was the most successful for each of the 218 learners. These strategies were categorized into eight instructional focuses: comprehension, functional language, games, interests, language experience, motivation, self-concept enhancement, and study skills. The subsystem could now take the characteristics of a learner as provided on the taxonomy (the learner profile) and recommend which instructional focus(es) would be the most likely to succeed.

Subsequently, undergraduate and graduate students in Newman's

and Metz's classes were asked to complete profiles for each of their learners. The recommendations made by CONSULT-I® Reading were judged by students to be on target 95% of the time. Parents and cases involving reading problems in the Institute for Child Study's Interdisciplinary Clinic were also processed. Again, the recommendations of the program were judged appropriate.

The CONSULT-I® Reading subsystem was then used in a field study under a grant from Indiana University's School of Education's Maris and Mary Proffitt Fund. This study involved 70 learners (K-12) from 11 school districts. The study was successful as evidenced by the changes in both learners and teachers (see Appendix B for complete results as presented in the study's final report). As one teacher characterized her experience, the best part of the program was

> making me look closely at these five students.... My students succeeded because of improved self-concept which I could encourage from the support of your program....

The learner evaluations showed that 79% were now choosing to read more and 73% were now enjoying reading more. Fifty-seven percent of the learners had a better attitude toward learning.

During the 1991-92 school year a project, CONSULT-I® Reading Ohio, funded by the Ohio State Legislature was conducted in inner city elementary schools of five Ohio cities: Akron, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Columbus, and Toledo. As in the earlier field study, many positive changes were reflected by both teachers and learners (see Appendix C).

The broad goals of the CONSULT-I® Reading Ohio Project were

1. To help teachers focus their instruction through the recommendations for individual learners so that the instruction is more efficient and effective, and that each learner has the greatest chance of success.

2. To help the learner enjoy reading (affect), to want to read (attitude), and thus become a better reader (success).

Each district chose one elementary school to participate in the program. Five teachers from each school volunteered to take part in the project.

Each teacher chose five learners from his/her classroom to participate in the project. Insofar as possible these learners were to be children not served by other programs who were having difficulty with reading. Of the 134 learners (some of the original

125 moved and were replaced by others), 40 were in first grade, 37 in second grade, 21 in third grade, 25 in fourth grade, and 11 in fifth grade.

Many different responses were elicited from the teachers to the question, "What have you done differently...?"

- children making individual books
- children interacting with each other more
- teacher focusing on self-esteem issues
- teacher focusing on specific learners
- children making games
- children more involved in learning
- teacher listened more to answers of children
- teacher implemented strategies sooner and more consistently
- teacher worked with small group

In response to individual teacher goals, the following statements were made:

- I do more things in reading that are interesting to children. In many cases my children understood more when they were interested in a topic.
- I have learned to vary my approach to reading. By mixing strategies it keeps my teaching fresh and the children like doing "different" things in reading. Also weak areas in a student can be strengthened by using multiple strategies.
- Teaching reading has definitely been harder as far as time is concerned. It takes more time to prepare but the results seem to show improvement when a child is motivated.
- Pupils chose books that interested them. Pupils voluntarily read more, made wiser choices when selecting books.
- They were more willing to try. They felt a part of the group for they were making contributions.

When asked to describe the difference that the program made for their learners, the teachers made statements as follows:

- He was excited about reading and I feel these activities motivated him
- She has more confidence, often volunteering to read aloud or answer questions
- He is able to find books of interest in the library with little guidance. His sense of curiosity has also expanded.
- I believe that the extra attention made her feel special and helped motivate her.
- Without the use of this program, this student's

skill level would be lower that it is now.
- This learner is more cooperative and more motivated in reading.

A third grader wrote us this letter in March.

> Dear Indiana,
> I think reading is very nice. I haved thought reading was going to be boring. But now I know it is fun to read. I hope you know that we have to know we need reading. My favorite book is Clifford's Manners. That is a nice story. I have leared to read more. I go home and read every day. Thanks you for your help.
>
> Your friend,

The generally positive responses of teachers in the Ohio project (1991-92) suggest several conclusions:

> CONSULT-I® Reading does provide an efficient, cost-effective teacher training program for dealing with troubled readers.
>
> It provides teachers with reinforcement for many methods with which they are already familiar, but does this in such a focused way as to enable them to move more quickly to make application of appropriate strategies.
>
> It provides teachers with a truly individualized approach to teaching reading, which is flexible and often appropriate for whole class application.

The program appears to work best with teachers who are flexible, open, and willing to vary instruction to meet the needs of individual children.

That the instruction guided by the CONSULT-I® Reading recommendations is more efficient and effective is well shown in the testimony given by one first grade teacher concerning a student who was not originally selected for participation in the program:

> The proof for me ... was in the recommendations I received for Julius after the program was over. I have anguished over this child most of the year trying to reach him and love him and by March was finally able to begin making significant progress with him. We're on a roll now and we're making up for a lost 6 months in a short time.
>
> I believe the year would have been different if I'd

had the specific strategies and the technology to "focus" my attention (sooner).

Cincinnati

Introduction

The Grants Administration office of the Cincinnati School District agreed to fund the CONSULT-I® Reading Cincinnati Project at two Urban Demonstration Project elementary schools for the Spring Semester 1993. Before the beginning of the project one of the schools decided that it was too late in the school year to start a new program. South Avondale Elementary decided to participate in the program.

A meeting was held with the South Avondale principal on January 15 to set up the timeline for the program (Appendix D).

Participants

Eight classroom teachers and two Gifted and Talented (GT) coordinators volunteered to participate in the program. The classroom teachers taught first through fourth grade with two teachers from each grade level.

The teachers then chose 5 or 6 learners from their classrooms who were below level in reading. There were 11 learners in first grade, 11 in second grade, 11 in third grade, and 10 in fourth grade for a total of 43 learners. The Gifted and Talented coordinators felt that they did not know their students well enough to complete learner profiles on them as they only met with them one hour a week.

All of the learners were Afro-American. Sixty-seven percent of them lived in single parent homes, 19% in two parent homes, and the other 14% lived in the homes of other family members, friends, or foster parents.

Methodology

The methodology of this project was similar to that of the 1991-92 Ohio project (see Appendix E). The one major difference was the time factor as the present project did not begin until the second semester (February 5, 1993).

Teacher training. A significant aspect of the program is the teacher training provided for the collection of learner characteristic information (the learner profile), the implementation of the instructional focuses, and the process of collecting assessment data. A one-day workshop at the beginning of the project and 3 on-site visits and inservices spread over the remainder of the semester provided this training. Both the project

director and research associate were involved in the training presentations.

Procedures

On February 5 an all-day workshop (see Appendix F for agenda) was held with the 10 participating teachers to introduce them to the program and outline the initial steps they would need to take. The background of CONSULT-I® and the Reading Practicum Center were discussed.

Each feature of the taxonomy with its values was individually discussed with examples given. It was noted that although the taxonomy originally consisted of 94 features, it was possible to eliminate all but twenty of those features w[illegible] the remaining twenty distinguishing most successfully those learners who were successful.

Each teacher participant then completed a sample learner profile for some child in his/her classroom/program with the information they had at hand. They were encouraged to ask questions and make comments as they completed the profile under the supervision of the project director and research associate.

The eight instructional focuses (comprehension, functional language, games, interest, language experience, motivation, self-concept enhancement, and study skills) were introduced through a strategy booklet which provides samples of most successful strategies as extracted from actual case studies (Newman and Metz, 1988). Unit development projects from the RPC were shown to illustrate the various focuses.

The teachers were instructed to choose learners from their classrooms who were below level in reading to participate in the project. The teachers were asked to complete a learner profile for each child chosen and to return the profiles to the RPC by February 19 for processing. These profiles with their accompanying recommendations were to be returned to the teachers at the February 26 inservice meeting. As it turned out a snow storm forced rescheduling of this meeting to March 9 so the recommendations were returned to the teachers through the mail.

Telephone contact was maintained with the school on each Tuesday afternoon at 2:30 p.m. for the purpose of answering teacher questions.

Due to the change in date (from February 26 to March 9 as noted above) the first on-site classroom visits and inservice were conducted by the research associate only. Each of the eight participating classrooms was observed for approximately 15 minutes during the morning of March 9. The inservice was held for an hour and a half in the afternoon. Handouts containing definitions for

each instructional focus and affect, attitude, and success were given to each teacher and discussed. (See Appendix G for agenda.)

Implementation of the learner recommendations was discussed with emphasis on the possibilities for using the recommendations across the curriculum. The time factor was also discussed with the note that the amount of time spent could vary dependent on the current implementation but that time should be spent each week on the recommendations.

The anecdotal records (Appendix H) were discussed with the suggestion given that they be completed at the end of each week noting the activities carried out during the week with the learner reactions to each activity. It was noted that these records are "reality checks" for both teacher and RPC staff as they show how well the recommendations were carried through. (Examples of completed records had been given to the teachers in their notebook at the workshop.)

An Affect, Attitude, Success Matrix (Appendix I) was then discussed and the teachers completed one under the supervision of the research associate. They were then given time to complete the others at the end of the inservice.

The second site visit and inservice was April 1. Again, each classroom was observed for 15 minutes in the morning and the inservice was held in the afternoon (see Appendix J for agenda).

At the beginning of the inservice the teachers were encouraged to share any changes they had seen in the participating learners since the recommendations had been implemented. Anecdotal records were discussed in detail with examples given and the teachers were reminded to complete them at the end of each week. Teachers were given time during the inservice to complete one under the supervision of the RPC staff.

A handout concerning the interrelationship of art, music and writing composition was given to each teacher and discussed. A short form of the Chocolate Curriculum, an across-the-content-areas curriculum centered around chocolate and developed for an Indiana University practicum class, was also given to each teacher with the entire curriculum given to one of the Gifted and Talented Coordinators for sharing. This was done to emphasize the relationship of reading and writing to all of the content areas and to demonstrate to the teachers how they could use any of the content areas to carry out the CONSULT-I® Reading recommendations.

Chalkboard writing by learners was discussed (each classroom has four small chalkboards on the closet doors) and a copy of Writing: A language arts booster in the primary grades (Reid, Jenkins, Newman, and Parr, 1981) was given to the group to be shared. Several teachers also ordered their own copies. The use

of individual slates by each learner was also discussed.

The teachers were asked to complete the second entry on the Affect, Attitude, Success Matrix for each learner on April 15 and send a copy to the Reading Practicum Center.

The final site visit and inservice was May 28. This was changed from the original date of May 20 due to Career Week at the school. Classrooms were observed for approximately 15 minutes each during the morning and the inservice was held in the afternoon.

At the beginning of the inservice (see Appendix K for agenda) teachers were given a copy of their individual goal(s) which they had written at the beginning of the project. They were asked to respond to these goals in writing and turn in their responses at the meeting or with their program assessment questionnaire.

Both program (Appendix L) and learner (Appendix M) assessment questionnaires were explained and a due date of June 7 was established. At this time the teachers would also turn in a copy of their anecdotal records and the Affect, Attitude, Success Matrix with the third entry completed. Attached to the learner assessment form was a set of criteria (Appendix N) for determining the success level of the learner.

Each teacher had been asked to bring learner developed projects to share at the meeting. This sharing was done at the end of the inservice along with many success stories.

Findings

Both process (the functioning of the program) and product (the success of the learners) were examined at the end of the project. The teachers completed one questionnaire concerning the process and a second questionnaire concerning the success of each learner. The findings reported by the teachers in these, along with the Affect, Attitude, Success Matrices and anecdotal records, are presented in the following.

Program. *1 - Suggestions for future schedules of first workshop.* All of the teachers recommended starting at the beginning of the school year. Most said September. One offered September or October. Another offered the beginning of the second semester as an alternative.

2 - Suggestions for changes in the first workshop. All of the teachers responded that the goals of the project were clear. Eighty-eight percent said that learner profiles were adequately explained. Seventy-five percent felt that adequate explanations had been provided for entering the anecdotal records. Eighty-eight percent felt that adequate explanation was provided for the

Affect/Attitude/Success matrices.

[Ed. note. A beginning teacher was consistently "undecided" in her responses to all of these questions.]

3 - Teacher preferences as to length of project. Sixty-two percent of the teachers opted for a two-semester engagement in the project. Twenty-five percent said that they would prefer one semester. One person (13%) said she would like to apply the CONSULT-I® Reading strategies for three-fourths of the year.

4 - Awareness of learner needs and interests. Every teacher mentioned the significance of learning the child's interests and using this knowledge in structuring a reading program. One teacher's particularly descriptive account catches the essence of what CONSULT-I® Reading can accomplish given a supportive teacher.

> The CONSULT-I® Reading Project assisted me greatly in providing strategies that I could use to reach every child by using a wholistic approach. I became acutely aware of the learners' interests by asking each of them to write their autobiography. It came at an appropriate time because we were studying about autobiographies in our reading text. I made it a project for the entire class. After reading the autobiographies of the designated learners, through the strategies recommended I was able to get a clearer insight for each learner. I was amazed at what I learned

Interests

- One boy's interest in dinosaurs earned him a dinosaur for every assignment completed. He also made a book about dinosaurs and wrote to the Museum of Natural History for further information. (#66)
- They have loved writing at the chalkboard (first grade). The Booster book, Writing: A Language Arts Booster in the Primary Grades, is terrific.... All are writing. (#66)
- We used Ninja Turtle books to learn function words. They loved doing it. What Really Happened to the Gingerbread Boys ... and Girls was another favorite. (#68)
- Art production in the whole family has increased due to the awakening of the CONSULT-I® kid. (#63)
- One child asked to stay after school to play the baseball spelling game. (#67)
- All of my children want to be in this (CONSULT-I®) group. (#65)
- He wrote words for the talent show. Now listens and follows directions. He's reading more and he understands that he has to put forth effort. (#64)
- We've done a lot with stories such as The Little Red Hen in which children change characters to suit their fancy. They've created their own weird animals. (#65)
- The children had been primed to share favorite parts of the readers they had completed. They obviously were proud of their books, held in affection by their teacher and, reciprocally, fond of her. She had asked them to share their favorite page in front of the class, telling in complete sentences why they liked it. "I liked it because ..." after reading it to us and to the class. The small class, seated in a U shape with the teacher in front, displayed a quiet earnestness about their task. One girl, sitting beside the desk where I had sat down, found the stories quickly and shared them with me.

  And then came the sharing of writing they had done. One boy, intensely interested in cars, shared his report. (He had proudly showed us the book on cars he was reading at his desk earlier.) Another had written a summary of baseball. A third, disciplined for the day and sitting alone by the door, shared his poems. "All About Me" -- and others. "He loves to write poems," his teacher had told us. And so we saw the handiwork of an experienced teacher, one who, despite her many years of teaching, was so gracious and receptive that new ideas bore fruit for her within three short months.

about these designated students. (#63)

[Ed. note: #61-68 denote numbers assigned to teachers participating in the project.]

5 - *Appropriateness of CONSULT-I® Reading recommendations.* The teachers were unanimous in applauding the appropriateness of the CONSULT-I® Reading recommendations. For example,

- I thought I had tried everything with the students until I used the individualized approach (#61)
- Every one of my children's achievements increased. (#66)

6 - *Did the CONSULT-I® Reading recommendations assist you in focussing instruction for your learner?* The teachers were unanimous in judging the CONSULT-I® Reading recommendations to have assisted them in focussing instruction. Specifically, they noted that

- the recognition of the effectiveness of interest was a new perception -- "I never considered using the child's interest as a way to gain reading skills or writing skills." (#61)
- they could plan activities that would teach and interest at the same time. (#68)
- individualizing instruction was helpful academically and attitudinally. (#65)
- the recommendations seemed to lead "right to the correct strategies that brought about learning." (#66)
- it really did help to gear the lessons towards their needs. (#67)

Language Experience

- Oh, that's great. We did language experience stories after school. ... And we made books! (#61)

Motivation

- The kids read to peers. They get stickers. And they read to make our bookworm grow. (#64)

Comprehension

- He reads without missing every other word now. His word attack has improved tremendously. He reads and comprehends now. Before he stumbled through. (#64)

7a - *How often did you implement the CONSULT-I® Reading recommendations?* Most of the teachers implemented the CONSULT-I® Reading recommendations at least once a week. One teacher noted that she only did CONSULT-I® activities biweekly for the first two months, but that by the last month she was doing them weekly.

7b - *How much time (on average) did you spend with learners and in preparation each week?* Time spent per week with learners

and in preparation ranged from eight and one half hours to one and a half hours (although this response is ambiguous and may have meant time spent per child). These figures represent more time invested per week this year than during the 1991-92 project.

7c - How much time (on average) is spent in record keeping each week? Time spent ranged from half an hour to an hour and a half per week. One teacher (#62) said she spent "too much"! Her careful, detailed, insightful records, however, reflected the investment.

[Ed. note 1: Money was allotted within the grant for teacher compensation for record keeping above and beyond normal teaching responsibilities.]

[Ed. note 2: One teacher was unable to complete the rest of the questionnaire due to personal problems.]

8 - What have you done differently? The teachers reported having done more with children's interests, more activities, more dictated writing, and more trade books. Two responses in particular caught the changes that occurred in the teachers' activities and behavior:

- I made booklets, made a lot of parent contacts, learned to keep better records on children having problems reading and how to help children want to read - motivation. I listened to the children longer than ever before. (#61)
- I focussed more on the needs of the whole child with the intention of helping every child to feel some measure of success in reading. (#63)

9 - Was it easy, somewhat difficult, difficult to implement the strategy recommendations in your classroom? Teachers were evenly split in their responses between easy and somewhat difficult. The direction of the response was often colored, for example, by

1) the size of class

- I have a very large class. Many needed individual attention. Some students have tested LD. They have many problems. (#61)

2) the type of strategy

- Some strategies were easy but some were difficult. I found that it was difficult to do writing dictation in the class. (#67)

However, the general direction of the responses was a recognition

that "...knowing what the students were interested in made it easy for me to implement the strategies."(#65) There is an interesting side note: "Other students not in program became jealous of other activities of CONSULT-I® Reading learners." (#68)

10 - Are the recommendations practical for classroom use? Three teachers rated the recommendations as preeminently practical for classroom use. Another two teachers responded with a 2 (highly practical) and one teacher with a 3 (practical). None of the teachers perceived the suggestions as impractical.

11 - Was the support of the Reading Practicum Center staff helpful? One hundred percent of the responding teachers rated the Reading Practicum Center staff as helpful assigning ratings as follows: 63% - highly helpful; 13% - very helpful; and 13% - helpful.

12 - Were the site visits/inservice helpful? All responding teachers perceived the Reading Practicum Center staff visits as helpful, 75% of them giving the visits the top rating and 13% rating them very helpful.

13 - Was the strategies booklet useful? Seventy-five percent of the responding teachers found the strategy booklet highly useful and 13% -very helpful.

14 - Were the strategy explanations easy to understand? Teachers reported the explanations easy to understand: 50% marked a 1; 25% marked a 2; and 25% gave no response.

Functional Language

- They love to play teacher. (#64)
- They've been trading letters and maps of other countries. (#64)
- The CONSULT-I® Club became group/class leaders. (#64)
- We had Career Week last week. They wrote why they wanted to be truck drivers and speech pathologists. Did a book about patients. They did job applications and interviews. (#65)
- We sent letters to another grade. (#68)
- They liked the functional language experience. We wrote letters which they shared with "little people ...." They're sequencing their story panels. (#61)

15 - Was there adequate time for strategy explanation in the workshop and inservices? An interesting array of responses occurred for this question. Although we generally have not identified respondents in these findings, and shall not do so by name now, it does seem significant that most teachers, except the one with least experience, rated the time for strategy explanation as adequate.

16 - Were the strategy examples easy to implement? The responses to this question were split along the lines similar to those reported above. Sixty-three percent of the responding teachers reported the strategies easy to implement. Thirteen

percent rated them with a "2" (next to the top), and 13% rated them with a "3" (fairly easy).

17 - Are you aware of parent reactions to CONSULT-I® Reading? All parents responded positively in some degree to the specialized attention their children received through CONSULT-I® Reading. As one teacher put it "The parents as a group became more involved and wanted to talk about strategies they could use at home (#66)."

Parental Involvement

- Parent now includes a note in child's lunch box. (#67)
- Teacher and child send home notes in lunch box. (#67)
- Parent now anxious to pick up children after school. (#66)
- Children now reading to them. (#66)
- Children have blossomed. (#66)
- Parents came in (!) to answer profile. (#61)
- All but two parents came to school to discuss children's profile. (#64)
- Children are living a fantasy world (of happiness). Parents are coming in to verify. (#62)
- Many conferences with parents. Most supportive parent ever. Both parents working. (#61)

Inservice meeting, 5/28/93

18 - What was the best part of the CONSULT-I® Reading project? Responses varied. For some the recommendations and strategy booklet were best.

> • The strategy booklet and the interest sheet or learner profile fact sheet recommendation. (#61)
> • The inventory sheets [Ed. note: interest inventory included in strategy booklet] and the recommendation sheets. (#62)

For others the focus and matching of learner characteristics with appropriate strategy were best.

> • Seeing that finding the right prescription for each child and correct strategies, all children can learn. (#66)
> • The focussed strategy recommendations and the positive attitudes the students gained toward reading. All of the students enjoy reading. (#67)
> • The activities which are correlated according to the particular learner's background. (#68)

While for some teachers the satisfaction of implementing an effective strategy and seeing children improve was best.

> • Being able to implement the different strategies and seeing the children show improvement in reading and other subject areas. (#65)
> • I was able to see some measure of improvement in every learner that participated, some more than others. It was a pleasure to see smiles on faces that had never been there before. It was rewarding to see children become excited about learning and reading. (#63)

19 - Suggestions for CONSULT-I® Reading project are: Two major recommendations emerged:

1) Provide initial orientation before school starts.

- Do initial orientation to program a week before school begins. Then by mid September you would be able to begin implementation. Record keeping should be open (weekly, bi-weekly, etc.) Time period 1st - 3rd quarter. It would enable you to have quality time and accurate growth data. (#62)
- To start at the beginning of school year and more inservices. (#68)

2) Minimize paper work.

- During the first meeting give an overview of all the paperwork needed to be completed. Make sure to mention to do the paper work right away (Ed. note: This was done.) (#61)
- The CONSULT-I® Reading should have an assistant on a part time basis to assist with the paper work, make parent contact, and help with activities preparation, and assist in grading. (#63)
- To cut down on the paper work. I found myself using a lot of repetition in filling out the forms and evaluation. (#65)

20 - From my experience with the CONSULT-I® Reading project I learned the following. Most of the responses bore on focussed individualization of instruction using one of the most powerful motivators available--the child's own interests.

Because of the special significance of these responses we reproduce them here in their entirety.

- I learned how to help children not interested in reading and writing gain interest. Furthermore, the nonreaders are trying to read. I learned that it's important to record individual difference of children. Also keep an on-going record of research on every child. (#61)
- A child's interest plays a major role in his/her learning. Once you discover that you can build your curriculum or lessons around it. Learning also becomes fun for the child. (#62)

Using Literature
(including Individualized Reading)

- We do fairy tales once a week now from My Book of Make Believe (#62)
- We have storytime every day. Especially enjoyed Two Little Goats Who Wouldn't Stop Fighting, A Nightmare in my Closet (Mercer Mayer), Who Am I? (an All About Me type story) (#62)
- Doris Brett's Annie's Stories A Special Kind of Story Telling (bibliotherapy). (#62)
- Nonreaders are now reading high interest/low vocabulary books (#61)
- We're working with multicultural folktales.... I don't have one nonreader now. (#67)

- Every child no matter what level can experience some measure of success if a wholistic approach such as CONSULT-I® Reading is used on a regular basis. (#63)
- Many different strategies can be used to help motivate the learner show improvement in academics as well as certain behaviors. (#65)
- That there is a strategy that meets every child's needs and will help them achieve. If you find the right motivators every child can learn through his interests. (#66)
- All students want to feel good about reading and that it really doesn't take that much time to change attitudes toward reading. (#67)
- How to prepare lessons to fit the child and how to be sympathetic with students who need extra special help. (#68)

21. *Teacher Goal Response.* In this question the teachers were asked to respond to their individual teacher (i.e., personal) goals for the project as recorded at the first inservice meeting (February 5, 1993). In every case their original goals were met as indicated by a plus (+) in the right hand column.

TABLE I

Teacher Responses to Original Goal Statements

Original Goal (2/5/93)	Response to Original Goal (5/28/93)	Evaluation
I want to learn how to help children having difficulties with basic skills. Such as, learning and remembering the alphabet, also how to help children who can read but cannot comprehend. Furthermore, how do you work with children who don't want to learn or don't value the joy of reading? How do you help older children remain interested in reading and improve Jr. high reading skills?	Due to CONSULT-I® strategies I did see improvement with the alphabet and memorization. The language experience helped student improve comprehension. I held after school sessions with one or more students. We did the interest inventory. The attention they received seemed to spark an interest. We began to play games together and write sentences. We had small little toy snowmen, ice cream cones, skates, etc. The students dictated sentences to me. Then they read them to me. You should have seen the expressions on their faces. They were overjoyed. Try to provide discussion time with them. Read together aloud for short periods of time. Play word games.	+
I hope that this course will give more tools to better help my students. I am always open to learning newer and more effective approaches to teaching reading. Therefore, I should gain more knowledge in taking this course.	This program has provided me with several different approaches. It has also given me a better understanding of some techniques that I had been using.	+

A more efficient method of presenting and teaching reading so that all students no matter what their abilities can achieve an optimum amount of success in the reading area.	The CONSULT-I® gave me a more efficient method of presenting and teaching reading so that all students no matter what their abilities, could achieve an optimum amount of success at their reading level. The CONSULT-I® recommendations caused me to recognize the strengths and weaknesses of the learners. It also provided strategies that I could use in order to achieve my goal. I referred back to the Learner's Profile Sheet to see what the recommended strategies were so that I could use them to help the learner. I sought out ways through these strategies to focus on the needs of each learner so that everyone of them could gain some measure of success. I met the challenge and I am happy to say that I reached my personal goal in each child to some extent. As I continue to teach, I will use this method with all students.
I hope to be able to help students in my classroom who are below 4th grade level in reading learn skills that will make them successful readers so that they can pass to the fifth grade and enjoy reading.	I have provided activities that have helped students acquire some of the basic skills that will aid students in reading. The CONSULT-I® project activities helped me to zoom in on areas or specific problems that stumped me. Students who had unusual areas or specific problems to work on usually had to overcome self-control or attitude problems first. Then when the diagnosis of skills deficits by me as well as CONSULT-I® were implemented, improvement took place.
To meet the expectations of the child/children being able to read on level in all areas of reading.	The students aren't particularly reading on exact grade level. However, they've shown tremendous improvement especially in the areas they're interested. I am now able to use several different techniques and approaches which this program has offered which made me more aware of the children's interest.
I am very interested in the diagnostic and prescriptive portion of this program and hope to implement this into to my classroom. I am hoping to have better insight in how to help my slower students.	Everyone of my slower students have shown very nice gains. Three of my children who were very poor readers are now really reading and wanting to read everything they can get their hands on. The writing skills have improved greatly with all children. One little boy who was never motivated before is now writing stories very well on his own and is doing a little better in completing more classwork. All children can now form sentences and make a complete story. I feel knowing where the weak areas are, learning what motivates each child and building a program for them that meets their needs will all build a good success level and high self-esteem. This program did all of this.

Skills to determine what the child's needs are and to implement the skills to increase success for the child	I thought that the computer recommendations printout was a great help. I think that the suggestions in the handbook were helpful but I would have appreciated more ideas. I saw progress and success in every child, with varying degrees. Next year I would choose different types of students. I would choose those students who are not reaching their potential. Many of the ideas and activities were very easy to implement in the whole class. I would also like to do an interest inventory with every student because they were so helpful.	+
Through this program, I hope to become more proficient in the teaching of reading. I hope that I am able to gain experience using these practices and others.	I think that I have become more proficient in the teaching of reading. The ideas are very useful and it is very important to concentrate on the individual learner. I am now able to use processes that I have already learned and add the new techniques from this program to my repertoire.	+

Learner. The progress or success of the learner in CONSULT-I® Reading is measured by changes in affect, attitude, and overall success. These changes in learners having reading problems have been found by the Reading Practicum Center personnel usually to occur before major changes in academic progress as reflected on standardized test scores. Since the starting date of the project was February and the district testing is in March of each year, standardized test scores were not used as a measurement of learners in the project.

Samples of the criteria used for rating the changes in affect, attitude, and success are shown in Tables 2 - 4. The changes are categorized into three groups -- high, medium, and low. Examples were extracted from statements made by the teachers on the Affect, Attitude, Success Matrix at the beginning of the project (February) and the end of the project (June). The ratings for affect and attitude were determined by the personnel of the Reading Practicum Center after receiving the final entry.

TABLE 2
Criteria and Examples for Changes in Affect

High — Very positive feelings at end of program
Ex: Feb - sleepy, dislikes reading, angry, sad
Jun - happy, content, likes to read
Ex: Feb - sneaky, disobedient, strong willed
Jun - happy, obeys directions, listens, works in group well

Medium — More positive feelings at end of program, still room to grow
Ex: Feb - moody, bossy, strong dislike for rules
Jun - less bossy & moody, likes to read
Ex: Feb - loud, rowdy, opinionated
Jun - more reserved most of the time

Low — Feelings have changes little or not at all, negative
Ex: Feb - defiant, dislikes school
Jun - still defiant, disruptive
Ex: Feb - sleeps, uninterested
Jun - likes storytime, otherwise uninterested

TABLE 3
Criteria and Examples for Changes in Attitude

High — Very positive outlook at end of program
Ex: Feb - negative, argumentative
Jun - really puts forth effort
Ex: Feb - evil & mean when corrected or shown how to do assignments
Jun - accepting of criticism, helpful to others

Medium — More positive outlook at end of program, still room to grow
Ex: Feb - semi-positive attitude, rushes through work
Jun - feels better about own reading, writing
Ex; Feb - somewhat positive
Jun - tries harder, needs positive encouragement

Low — Attitude has changed little or not at all, negative
Ex: Feb - negative toward school work
Jun - still negative
Ex: Feb - negative toward work
Jun - rather play than work

TABLE 4
Criteria for Success

High	The learner who has shown high success will have made significant progress in his/her academic achievement. For example, he/she will now be reading on a higher level than in February and/or have a higher grade in reading on the report card.
Medium	The learner will have made progress in the classroom but it will not necessarily be reflected in a higher reading level or grades. It will be based on teacher observation and may include positive changes in affect and attitude.
Low	The learner will have made little or no progress in the classroom.

The rating for success includes not only the entries on the Affect, Attitude, Success Matrix but semester long observation as well, thus it was deemed more appropriate to ask the teachers rather than the Reading Practicum Center personnel to rate overall success. They were given the criteria at the last inservice. The teachers' ratings were entered on the learner assessment questionnaire which was completed in June.

Learner changes in affect, attitude, and overall success in this program are presented in Tables 5 - 8. Data are missing for four learners who had moved and for five learners in grade 4 whose teacher was unable to complete the assessment questionnaires due to personal problems.

Thirty-six percent of the learners in the program had high changes in affect and 49% had medium changes for a total of 85% of the learners with a positive change in affect. High changes in attitude were reflected in 33% of the learners and 56% had medium changes for a total of 89% of the learners with a positive change in attitude. Twenty-one percent of the learners were rated as high success and 59% of the learners were rated as medium success making a total of 80% of the learners with a positive success rating. (Five of the learners were not rated.) See Table 5.

TABLE 5
Affect, Attitude, Success

	High	Medium	Low
Affect	14(36%)	19(49%)	6(15%)
Attitude	13(33%)	22(56%)	4(11%)
Success	8(21%)	23(59%) (5 unrated)	3(8%)

TABLE 6
Changes in Affect by Grade Level

	High	Medium	Low
Grade 1	5(50%)	5(50%)	0
Grade 2	5(46%)	1(8%)	5(46%)
Grade 3	1(13%)	7(87%)	0
Grade 4	3(30%)	6(60%)	1(10%)

Positive changes (high/medium) in affect were shown by 100% of the students in grades 1 and 3 (Table 6). Ninety percent of the learners in grade 4 demonstrated positive changes in affect and 54% in grade 2.

TABLE 7
Changes in Attitude by Grade Level

	High	Medium	Low
Grade 1	2(20%)	7(70%)	1(10%)
Grade 2	3(27%)	5(46%)	3(27%)
Grade 3	3(38%)	5(63%)	0
Grade 4	5(50%)	5(50%)	0

All participating learners in grades 3 and 4 demonstrated positive changes (high/medium) in attitude while ninety percent of the children in grade 1 showed a positive change. Seventy-three percent of the learners in grade 2 had a positive change in attitude (Table 7).

From the ratings for success given by the teachers according to the criteria in Table 4 all of the learners (100%) in grades 1 and 3 showed success. Seventy-four percent of the children in grade 2 demonstrated success. All of the learners in grade 4 who were rated showed success.

TABLE 8
Changes in Success by Grade Level

	High	Medium	Low
Grade 1	2(20%)	8(80%)	0
Grade 2	2(18%)	6(56%)	3(26%)
Grade 3	2(25%)	6(75%)	0
Grade 4	2(20%)	3(30%) (5 unrated)	0

The teachers were asked to use their judgment to rate the learners on observed changes in self-concept. The categories were great, some, or little. All of the learner who were rated (5 unrated in grade 4) showed improvement in self-concept (Table 9).

TABLE 9
Changes in Self-concept by Grade Level

	Great	Some	Little
Grade 1	5(50%)	5(50%)	0
Grade 2	4(36%)	7(64%)	0
Grade 3	5(63%)	3(37%)	0
Grade 4	3(30%)	2(20%) (5 unrated)	0

The teachers were asked to describe the difference (if any) which participation in the program made to the learner. According to teacher responses for 77% of the learners the program did make a difference and for 10% of the learners it made some difference. The other 13% of the learners were unrated. Representative comments are as follows:

- self-concept good, wants to share and participate more in class, grades have gone up in all areas, is my true miracle. (#6604)
- 1-on-1 very motivating, settled down, B- in reading (F's last year). (#6702)
- definitely performed better, her grades have improved, she takes great pride in showing her mother her improved

work. (#6802)

- I believe he writes better, didn't make any effort until we began letter writing. (#6101)
- can read now, before he was not interested in reading, he did not think he could learn how to read, talks more, smiles more, mother very happy. (#6103)
- helped this learner realize she could experience success. (#6303)
- learner has had almost perfect attendance since she has been in the program, she is now one of the best readers in the class, she improved on all tests. (#6305)

[Ed. note: #6101-6806 denote numbers assigned to learners participating in the project.]

Data Analysis. The CONSULT-I® Learning System was used by Dr. Patrick to analyze the data returned by the teachers at the end of the program for each learner. As during the 1991-92 project, the learners this semester who demonstrated a positive change in both affect and attitude had a 95% probability of success in the program.

Other data analysis by the CONSULT-I® Learning System will be included in a technical report to be published at a later date.

Discussion

The first broad goal of the CONSULT-I® Reading project is for the learner

> to enjoy reading (affect), to want to read (attitude) and thus become a better reader (success).

Most of the learners (85%) who participated in the program came to enjoy reading more (positive change in affect) and 89% of the learners came to want to read (positive change in attitude). Eighty percent of the learners (5 were unrated) became better readers (high/medium success). One teacher noted, and undoubtedly all were grateful, for the improvement in the learners.

In the findings it appeared that the percent of learners showing positive changes in affect and attitude were low for second grade. This is probably the result of the variation in starting dates for implementation by the teachers. While most teachers began implementation in late February or early March, according to her anecdotal records, one second grade teacher did not start until April. Her learners, therefore, had a shorter length of time to show changes.

These findings are consistent with the findings in the Ohio project (1991-92) in which 85% of the learners came to enjoy

reading more, 84% developed a better attitude toward reading, and 84% became better readers (success).

At the beginning of the project the teachers were asked to select the learners who were having the most problems with reading in their classrooms. Of these learners (5 unrated) the program made a difference for 77%. This appears to be an excellent result as the regular school curriculum had apparently been unable to reach these learners before the CONSULT-I® Reading program began in February. In an additional case the teacher felt that the program would have made a difference if problems at home had been resolved.

From National Assessment results findings (Ward, 1993) are reported that minority children can not or do not perform as well academically as non-minorities. The current project at South Avondale School and results from the Ohio project (Newman & Metz, 1992) in which Afro-American learners had a 89% probability of success in comparison to a 81% probability for Caucasian learners suggest the contrary. Reading Practicum Center personnel had been encouraged in 1991 to include ethnic and family structure data although these features had already been found to be nondiscriminating in the course of the taxonomy development. Further study certainly needs to be pursued; however, these heuristic findings should encourage the recognition that children, when interested in what they are doing and properly motivated, can achieve regardless of color or family structure (see also Bruce, 1992).

The second broad goal of CONSULT-I® Reading is to help teachers focus their instruction through the recommendations for individual learners so that the instruction is more efficient and effective and that each learner has the greatest chance of success.

All of the responses on the program assessment questionnaire, each in its own way, spoke to the effectiveness and efficiency of CONSULT-I® Reading, both for the children and as an instrument in teacher training.

> The Last Inservice...
> 5/28/93
>
> The last inservice was a bubbly affair. The teachers were eager to continue with their learners and to share student work. They shared vivid examples of the outcomes of parent involvement and spoke of the "awakenings" of the CONSULT-I® children.

The answers to the question concerning teacher learning (Q. 20) were tremendously heartening if one is pursuing the possibility of changing in-service teacher behaviors. These very receptive teachers were responsive to suggestions, tailoring them to the individual needs and possibilities of their children.

One of the revelations of this project and a continuing

confirmation of what research has already shown with respect to the role of interest for the reluctant reader was how powerful building on learner interests can be toward contributing to growth in reading. For the past twenty-five years interest has been a prime building block in the successful solving of reading difficulties at the Reading Practicum Center. Almost every teacher in the Cincinnati project commented on how significant interest had been to the progress of the learners.

Most teachers did a good job of reporting, regardless of how much time they spent. Some simply needed more time to tell their story -- not so different from the reactions to other occurrences in the human experience.

Although the **strategy explanations** were perceived by the teachers as easy to understand, there were instances reported in the anecdotal records which suggested that the teachers did not, in actuality, fully understand some of the strategies. This became apparent through inaccurate categorization and lack of explicitness. It is important, therefore, that teacher awareness of category differences be sharpened throughout the project.

Responses of the inexperienced teacher showed that new teachers may need more time than experienced ones to absorb and implement this program.

One interesting note is the amount of parental involvement which seemed to be generated by the program. Teachers reported that some of the parents who helped answer learner profile questions, were willing to have their children participate after school and asked what they could do at home to help their child.
It was also noted that parents were pleased with the progress of their children who had participated in the program.

This was quite a change from last year's project in which, to our knowledge, there was little parent interaction. However, in fairness, we should say that we did not include this question last year, nor did we discuss parent involvement.

Recommendations

[Ed. note: The numbers in the following section refer to the questions on the program assessment questionnaire.]

1. Although these teachers had a highly successful experience with only four months involvement, they voted unanimously to have the **program start** at the beginning of the school year. We concur.

2. One further step should be included in the first inservice in order to further clarify the explanation of the **anecdotal records**. Clear examples of good <u>and</u> poor anecdotal records should be presented through transparency and handouts so that all are seeing,

discussing, and referring to the same thing from day one. For inexperienced teachers it might be useful to set up a monitoring system, "buddies," as it were, for collaboration. This could have the additional advantage of developing a sense of colleagueship and teamwork for both experienced and new teachers.

3. The decision as to one or two semester **length of project** may depend on individual circumstances, especially funding. The South Avondale teachers and children obviously had a highly successful one-semester experience. In our judgment, the eight or nine month engagement is preferable, but one semester has had excellent results and would certainly be preferable to no engagement.

4. Present a fact sheet at the first inservice on research findings as to the **role of interests** for encouraging the reluctant reader to succeed in reading. Consider doing the same for model, motivation, perseverance, and positive pressure -- variables identified in Newman's (1978, 1980, 1985) longitudinal research which were particularly beneficial in the experience of children who had been low readiness in reading in first grade.

Since the teachers in the 1993 Cincinnati South Avondale project were so successful in engaging **parental interest** and cooperation, it might be worthwhile to develop these materials to be parent-accessible, providing specific examples of what parents might do at home to support and extend the teacher's efforts.

5. The **appropriateness of the CONSULT-I® Reading recommendations** continues to be a source of amazement to teachers. The possibility of building on a solid data base and being able to trust the outcomes and recommendations appears to be a giant step forward in education.

A step might be taken of having teachers from the previous year meet with teachers for the upcoming year to discuss most-likely-to-succeed implementations of the CONSULT-I® Reading recommendations. For example, a teacher who knew of a child's love of maps or dinosaurs might share past highlights so the new teacher can build on past accomplishments.

6. The findings suggest some very positive possibilities for teacher training in terms of **instructional focus**. CONSULT-I® Reading calls for teachers to focus their instruction to meet the individual characteristics of the learner unlike conventional instruction in which curricular materials are usually selected months before teacher and learner meet. The South Avondale teachers were receptive and responsive to change. The results showed dramatic improvement in children's performance. However, participation in CONSULT-I® Reading should not be forced on teachers. They should be invited to participate. Such voluntary participation suggests a quality of thinking that may be significant in the degree of success enjoyed by the children.

Although not yet vigorously tested, our observation of teachers in the projects for the last two years suggests that open, receptive, enthusiastic teachers are more likely to carry CONSULT-I® Reading recommendations further than those teachers who are resistant, tepid, or fearful of change.

7a&b. Although as yet unexamined, future work needs to look at whether or not **time**, i.e., **frequency of implementation** is a determining variable in differences in pupil achievement.

7c. **Record keeping** is seldom a joy, but it is vital in documenting change, especially for CONSULT-I® Reading. Perhaps **time** could be set aside on a weekly basis for a team effort in recording results, with 15 minutes or so provided for sharing progress and ideas for overcoming problems. Given such a team effort, the invested time might not be missed so much, while at the same time teachers would enjoy the synergy of shared ideas.

8. Teachers should be encouraged to recognize that the **things they did differently** are the very **changes** that will result in positive **changes** in children's behaviors and performance. As mentioned above "briefs" or fact sheets on the effect of model, interest, perseverance, and positive pressure should be provided at the opening workshops and frequently revisited during the year. Teachers should be given special recognition for implementation.

9. Use of aides, paraprofessionals, student interns, or parents could alleviate some of the **difficulties in implementing** the more individualized strategies. For example, teams might take language experience stories--one take down the dictation, another be in charge of typing and making copies or pamphlets of the children's work.

10. The search for **practicality** must be continued. Variations on the strategies now described in the strategies booklet--such as the Chocolate Curriculum, and art and music handouts--might be presented with particular emphasis on adaptations for classroom usage.

11. Use CONSULT-I® Reading-trained teachers with one or more years' experience as mentors for new teacher participants.

12. Even though the **site visits/inservices** were viewed by the teachers as helpful, they might be further strengthened by Reading Practicum Center personnel responding to anecdotal records during the inservice visits. For example, if observers could review the anecdotal records while in a given classroom, this could bring more immediacy in their responses to the teachers in the inservice which follows.

One semester with monthly inservices hardly allows time to bring the quality of the Anecdotal Records, for example, to a higher

level of clarity. However, given the careful attention the teachers gave to the completion of these records, they turned out well; even in this short semester. Given monthly inservices, over the course of a year, practice could be offered in the refinement of the anecdotal records.

13. Complete reading of the strategy booklet prior to the opening of school might further enhance the usefulness of the booklet.

14. It might be useful, throughout the inservices, to clarify, with good and poor examples, the intent and implementation of the strategies.

15. Consideration might be given to providing a "training caboose" for inexperienced teachers, a **time** when they could ask questions or discuss results without their experienced colleagues.

16. As indicated in preceding recommendations, it might be useful to provide teachers with brief descriptions of how teachers in preceding projects **implemented the strategies.**

17. Given the current emphasis on family and intergenerational literacy we find it quite heartening that the **parent reactions** were so positive. We would recommend a direct overtures to parents early in the project, perhaps a letter and a booklet to let them know how they might best support the CONSULT-I® Reading recommendations during and after the project.

18. Teachers identified several **"best parts"** of the project. Therefore, simply sharing these findings with new participant teachers should be encouraged.

19. **Good ideas for future projects** included: "to have scheduled time during the week to do small group activities or to tie-in with ESEA (Elementary and Secondary Education Act) [instruction] ." (#67).

As to **time of initial orientation**, we agree that a week or so before school starts is desirable.

Paperwork for the project, although accomplished by most teachers in less than an hour per week, was a trial for some. One possibility for minimizing repetition in anecdotal records would be to code responses. For example, when a teacher does the same thing with several children, or with one child over several sessions, she might give the description a number or letter the first time, with subsequent codings qualified as necessary.

Reading Practicum Center personnel responses to anecdotal records during and following classroom observations should help to make teacher entries more effective and efficient.

20. Busy teachers take short cuts in recording their victories as well as their defeats. We heard many more success stories than we read in the anecdotal records. To track the full effect of using the CONSULT-I® Reading recommendations we might provide tape recorders for teacher recording of oral observations. These recordings might then be transcribed and returned to the teachers for editing and highlighting. This approach has the added benefit of maximizing the input of a large number of teachers who may be more comfortable working in an oral rather than a written tradition. The reports would be richer. However, the project would have to bear the cost of a full time transcriber.

Conclusions

Once again, we have found that flexible, open, receptive, willing-to-experiment teachers see fine results using CONSULT-I® Reading. These teachers working with children in the midst of life and death situations, many of whom have had little expectation of a life of quality for their students, have had their hope restored. Teacher training institutions should recruit potential teachers with these characteristics as assiduously as the Bobby Knights of the basketball court search for their next stars.

If teacher observations regarding their own learning such as those recorded in this project could be replicated nationally we could revolutionize the experience of the so-called low group child. For, at last, there is a scientific, data-based means of individualizing instruction. Individual children's characteristics can be matched to instructional strategies which will be most likely to succeed using the CONSULT-I® Reading program. The inefficient and ineffective "trial and error" method of choosing appropriate instructional strategies for the individual learner can be left behind and truly individualized instruction can be carried out. Even in a one semester situation, though certainly preferable in two, **teachers** can be helped to be more **efficient and effective** in bringing about positive changes in learners.

One of the authors, conducting longitudinal studies of children who were low group in first grade, found that the variables of model, motivation, interest, perseverance, and positive pressure were significant in the turnaround of these children's experience as adults (Newman, 1978, 1980, 1985). These findings are once again corroborated in the experience of the Cincinnati project, as, indeed, they were last year in the Ohio project (Newman & Metz, 1992), both of which dealt exclusively with inner-city children. This project has shown that it is possible to accomplish **positive changes** in affect, attitude, and success with most likely to fail **inner-city children**, all of whom in this project were minorities, and many of whom were from single parent families. These children can come to feel good about themselves as readers and in the

process improved self-concept becomes a product.

Interest continues to play a key role in engaging these urban children whose life experiences cry for the release offered in methodologies such as the language experience approach.

When engaged meaningfully and early in the process, **parents** are interested and willing helpers and can continue to be the long term supporters so desperately needed by these children. And thus is the circle of parent, child, and school completed. The next step surely must be consideration of family literacy in which parents are included as learners in order to break the cycle of illiteracy.

CONSULT-I® Reading Cincinnati Project

Reference List

Bruce, Deborah A. (1992). Urban demonstration project results for the 1991-92 school year: Evaluation report. Cincinnati, OH: Research and Development Section, Department of Quality Improvement, Cincinnati Public Schools.

Newman, A. P. (1978). Twenty lives: A longitudinal study of the effects of 5 variables on the lives of 20 students who were low readiness in first grade (1964-1976). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University.

Newman, A. P. (1980). Twenty lives revisited: A longitudinal study of the impact of literacy on the occupations and schooling of students who were low reading readiness in first grade (1964-1976) - with special attention to model, motivation, interest, perseverance, and pressure. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University.

Newman, A. P. (1985). Twenty lives nineteen years later: A longitudinal study (1964-1983) of the impact of literacy on the occupations, schooling, and educational growth of young adults who were low reading readiness in first grade with special attention given to model, motivation, interest, perseverance, and pressure as aspects of background and mental environment. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University.

Newman, A. P. & Metz, E. M. (1989). A field study in the application of CONSULT-I® to the problem of inconsistency in diagnosis and treatment of reading difficulties, final report, Proffitt grant study. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University School of Education.

Newman, A. P. & Metz, E. M. (1988). Individualizing language strategies using CONSULT-I®. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Reading Practicum Center.

Newman, A. P.,, Metz, E. M., & Patrick, E. (1992). CONSULT-I® reading Ohio project: Final report. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Reading Practicum Center.

Reid, H. C., Jenkins, B., Newman, A. P., & Parr, B. (1981). Writing: A language arts booster in the primary grades. Cedar Rapids, IA: Write Way.

Ward, C. (1993). "Test score down again." In Rochford Register Star. Rochford, IL: Gannett.

CONSULT-I® Reading Cincinnati Project

List of Appendices

A. Taxonomy 32

B. Proffitt Study results 37

C. Ohio Project results 44

D. Timeline for project 68

E. Ohio Project (1991-92) methodology 69

F. Agenda for initial workshop (2/5/93) 72

G. Agenda for March 9 inservice 73

H. Anecdotal record form 74

I. Affect, Attitude, Success Matrix 75

J. Agenda for April 1 inservice 76

K. Agenda for May 28 inservice 77

L. Program assessment questionnaire 78

M. Learner assessment questionnaire 80

N. Success Criteria 81

O. Program Assessment Tabulation 82

CONSULT-I (R) READING

TAXONOMY

To complete a learner profile, choose the one value (answer) for each feature (question) that most accurately describes the learner. If more than one value applies to the learner, choose the one that has the greatest impact on the learner in relation to language learning. If there is insufficient evidence available to make a choice, choose "not able to judge." If none of the values apply, choose "no evidence."

1. WHAT **PLACE** DOES THE LEARNER HOLD IN **RELATION TO SIBLINGS**?

   1 oldest child
   2 middle child
   3 youngest child
   4 only child
   5 twin or multiple
   8 not able to judge
   9 no evidence

2. WHAT **LEVEL OF EDUCATION** HAS THE **MOTHER** OF THE LEARNER COMPLETED?

   1 eighth grade or less
   2 ninth through less than twelfth
   3 high school diploma or GED
   4 some college, vocational, or specialist training
   5 college degree
   6 currently attending school
   8 not able to judge
   9 no evidence

3. WHAT **LEVEL OF EDUCATION** HAS THE **FATHER** OF THE LEARNER COMPLETED?

   1 eighth grade or less
   2 ninth through less than twelfth
   3 high school diploma or GED
   4 some college, vocational, or specialist training
   5 college degree
   6 currently attending school
   8 not able to judge
   9 no evidence

4. WHAT TYPE OF **OCCUPATION** DOES THE **FATHER** OF THE LEARNER HAVE?

1 unskilled
2 skilled
3 highly skilled
4 management
5 professional
6 househusband
7 student
8 not able to judge
9 no evidence

5. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING **CULTURAL QUALITIES** OF THE LEARNER'S **FATHER** HAS THE GREATEST IMPACT ON THE LEARNER?

1 education / positive
2 education / negative
3 occupation / positive
4 occupation / negative
5 cannot read / negative
6 reads to child / positive
7 reading model / positive
8 not able to judge
9 no evidence

6. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING **CULTURAL QUALITIES** OF THE LEARNER'S **MOTHER** HAS THE GREATEST IMPACT ON THE LEARNER?

1 education / positive
2 education / negative
3 occupation / positive
4 occupation / negative
5 cannot read / negative
6 reads to child / positive
7 reading model / positive
8 not able to judge
9 no evidence

7. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING **INTERACTIONS** BETWEEN THE **LEARNER AND THE FATHER** HAS THE GREATEST IMPACT ON THE LEARNER?

1 working together / positive
2 playing together / positive
3 cultural, educational, organizational activities / positive
4 cultural, educational, organizational activities / negative
8 not able to judge
9 no evidence

8. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING **INTERACTIONS** BETWEEN THE **LEARNER AND THE MOTHER** HAS THE GREATEST IMPACT ON THE LEARNER?

1 working together / positive
2 playing together / positive
3 cultural, educational, organizational activities / positive
4 cultural, educational, organizational activities / negative
8 not able to judge
9 no evidence

9. HOW **OLD** IS THE LEARNER?

1 5 - 6
2 7 - 8
3 9 - 10
4 11 - 12
5 13 - 14
6 15 - 16
7 17 - 18
8 not able to judge
9 no evidence

10. DID THE LEARNER'S **PARENT(S) READ TO THE LEARNER BEFORE** HE/SHE **ENTERED SCHOOL**?

1 yes, parent(s) read to child regularly
2 no, parent(s) did not read to child regularly
8 not able to judge
9 no evidence

11. WHAT ARE THE LEARNER'S **READING HABITS**?

1 does not read
2 reads only for survival (street signs, labels, etc)
3 reads only what is required (for survival and school)
4 reads only school related materials
5 reads only what interests him/her
6 reads regularly
8 not able to judge
9 no evidence

12. WHAT IS LEARNER'S **FAVORITE SCHOOL SUBJECT**?

1 English
2 social studies
3 math
4 reading
5 health and physical education
6 home economics or shop
7 music / art
8 science
9 no evidence

13. WHEN **LISTENING**, AT WHAT **LEVEL** IS THE LEARNER'S ABILITY TO **COMPREHEND**?

1 above grade level
2 at grade level
3 below grade level
8 not able to judge
9 no evidence

14. WHEN **READING**, IS THE LEARNER'S ABILITY TO **COMPREHEND** A STRENGTH?

1 yes, a strength
2 no, average or weakness
8 not able to judge
9 no evidence

15. IS THE LEARNER **CREATIVE**?

1 yes, a strength or average
2 no, a weakness
8 not able to judge
9 no evidence

16. IS THE LEARNER **CURIOUS**?

1 yes, a strength
2 no, average or a weakness
8 not able to judge
9 no evidence

17. DO ANY OF THE FOLLOWING **CULTURAL PRESSURES** HAVE A **NEGATIVE** IMPACT *ON THE* LEARNER?

1 father / alcoholism / negative
2 father / language or dialect / negative
3 mother / language or dialect / negative
4 parents / divorced / negative
8 not able to judge
9 no evidence

18. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING **PERSONALITY TRAITS** DOES THE LEARNER HAVE?

1 reasonable self-concept
2 shy
3 lacking self-confidence
4 show-off, cocky, constantly seeks attention
5 uncooperative and self-willed
8 not able to judge
9 no evidence

19. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING VALUES **SELF MOTIVATES** THE LEARNER?

1 interests
2 willingness to accept responsibility
3 wants to please (love)
4 success
5 competition
6 need for independence
7 religion
8 wants to learn
9 no evidence

20. WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING VALUES PUTS THE GREATEST **PRESSURE** ON THE LEARNER?

1 parental expectations / positive
2 parental expectations / negative
3 teacher expectations / positive
4 teacher expectations / negative
5 peer pressure / positive
6 peer pressure / negative
7 home situation / negative
8 self-image (handicaps, retention, etc) / negative
9 no evidence

21. TO BE COMPLETED AT END OF SCHOOL YEAR

22. TO BE COMPLETED AT END OF SCHOOL YEAR

23. TO BE COMPLETED AT END OF SCHOOL YEAR

24. WHAT IS THE **ETHNIC BACKGROUND** OF LEARNER?

1 Afro-American
2 American Indian
3 Asian
4 Caucasian
5 Hispanic
6 other
8 not able to judge
9 no evidence

25. WHAT TYPE OF **FAMILY STRUCTURE** BEST DESCRIBES LEARNER'S HOME SITUATION?

1 single parent
2 traditional
3 foster parent(s)
4 living with other family members
5 living with friends
6 other
8 not able to judge
9 no evidence

Proffitt Study Results

Results. The teacher evaluations of the program are shown in Table 1. Totals of the top three rankings yielded the following results:

*100% agreed that the introduction to the program was easily understood.

*100% agreed that the taxonomy was easily understood.

*88% agreed that the profile sheet was easily understood.

*88% agreed that the collection of learner data was efficient.

*100% agreed that the recommendations for individual learners seemed appropriate.

*100% agreed that the strategy booklet's explanations and examples were easily understood.

*89% agreed that the strategy booklet was useful for program development.

*83% agreed that it was easy to implement the recommendations.

*93% agreed that the recommendations were practical for classroom use.

*79% agreed that the support/monitoring by RPC staff was helpful.

The areas which included negative responses were:

*12% disagreed that the profile sheet was easily understood.

*12% disagreed that the collection of learner data was efficient.

*11% disagreed that the strategy booklet was useful for program development.

*17% disagreed that it was easy to implement the recommendations.

*7% disagreed that the recommendations were practical for classroom use.

*21% disagreed that the support/monitoring by RPC staff was helpful.

Comments pertaining to the best part and the weakest part of the CONSULT-I (R) program are shown in Table 2. According

to the responding teachers, the strategy booklet with its easy to use, practical ideas was the best part of the program. Other items mentioned included being forced to focus on the individual learner, the recommendations, the support for the classroom teacher, the variety and flexibility, and the individualized approach. As one teacher characterized her experience, the best part of CONSULT-I (R) is "making me look closely at these 5 students! We developed more of a relationship from filling out forms 'together.' I solicited answers from parents on some questions - involving them , too! I'll definitely use (an) interest inventory in the future. My students succeeded because of improved self-concept which I could encourage from the support of your program. I am noticing reading grew the most! I wonder if writing will come as they enjoy reading to a greater extent?"

The weakest parts of the program as seen by the teachers were the collection of data for the taxonomy and implementing the strategies in the classroom.

The learner evaluations (see Tables 3 and 4) concerned with changes in affect showed that:

*73% now enjoy reading more

*79% now choose to read more

*48% now enjoy writing more

*41% now choose to write more.

Changes in attitude (see Tables 3 and 4) according to the evaluations showed

*57% have a better attitude toward learning now

*53% have a better self image.

High success as evidenced by significant progress in the classroom was demonstrated by 31% of the learners. Fifty-eight percent of the learners showed medium success (progress in the classroom) while 11% made little or no progress (low success).

Summary

The results of the study, as reflected in the program evaluations, show a positive reaction to most of the CONSULT-I (R) program. The focus on individualization and the strategies suggested in the booklet, Individualiziing Language Strategies Using CONSULT-I (R), were judged by the users to be very helpful. The negative responses show a need for more written guidance in several aspects of the program: taxonomy, profile sheet, and group implementation.

Learner evaluation reflected changes in affect in reading in a large number of learners and in writing in a moderate number of learners. The difference between the results in reading and those in writing show the need for more emplasis on writing strategies. There were also a moderate number of learners who changed in attitude toward learning and in self-image. The smaller number of learners with change in attitude complements the previous observations of the RPC staff that affect usually changes before attitude.

Discussion

The results of this study suggest that data based diagnostic and treatment recommendations do work, and that through the use of the CONSULT-I (R) program we are now able to provide an answer to the inconsistency of treatment predictions for classroom teachers and reading specialists. Feedback on positive aspects of the program was provided as well as identification of areas where further clarification is needed.

Recommendations

Given the findings, we recommend the following:

1. Continue trials of CONSULT-I (R) with graduate and undergraduate classes. Prepare teachers for the possibility of implementing recommendations for individual learners.

2. Offer CONSULT-I (R) to area schools on a fee basis.

3. Provide more complete written instructions including

*a taxonomy guide for responding to taxonomy choices

*written directions for completing the profile sheet

*suggestions in the strategy booklet for implementing recommendations for group instruction.

Table 1. Teacher Evaluation of Program - Likert Scale Responses

	Strongly Agree 1	2	3	4	Strongly Disagree 5
1. The introduction to CONSULT-I (R) was easily understood.	44%	50%	6%		
2. The taxonomy was easily understood.	33%	55%	12%		
3. The profile sheet was easily understood.	35%	35%	18%	12%	
4. The method of collection of learner data was efficient.	28%	33%	27%	6%	6%
5. The recommendations for individual learners seemed appropriate.	39%	55%	6%		
6. The strategy booklet's explanations and examples were easily understood.	66%	28%	6%		
7. The strategy booklet was useful for program development.	55%	28%	6%	11%	
8. It was easy to implement the recommendations.	44%	39%		17%	
9. The recommendations were practical for classroom use.	53%	27%	13%	7%	
10. The support/monitoring by RPC staff was helpful.	29%	21%	29%	14%	7%

Table 2. Teacher Evaluation of Program - Anecdotal Responses

Best Part

Strategy booklet

Strategy book - wealth of practical, innovative ideas for enhancing curriculum

Provided many easy to use ideas, very practical

Ideas for what to do with student to increase interest in reading

Practical and useful projects to encourage reading and writing

Easy to use, efficient, material targeted well

Pinpointing of specific problem(s) and focusing on problem area to build with specific tactics

Rewarding to know on the right track, forced to evaluate all aspects of learner's environment, understood needs and motivations

Recommendations

Provides more support for classroom teacher

Variety and flexibility

Individualized approach, addressing affect as precursor to reading activities

Weakest Part

Difficult to collect data for taxonomy

Collecting learner data

Some of the items on taxonomy list were confusing

Completing profile sheet

Implementation in classroom environment

Chapter One limitations

Difficulty in implementing program in classroom without training

Most of the methods for improvement were techniques already employed in classroom

Table 3. Learner Placement Pre and Post On Affect and Attitude*

	Low	Medium	High
Enjoys reading	xxxxxoooo	xxxxxooooo	xxoooooo
	xxxxx	xxxxxooooo	ooooo
	xxxxx	xxxxxooooo	ooooo
	xxxxx	xxxxxooooo	ooooo
	xxxxx	xooooo	oo
	xxxxx	oooo	
	xx		
Chooses to read	xxxxxoooo	xxxxxooooo	xooooo
	xxxxx	xxxxxooooo	ooooo
	xxxxx	xxxxxooooo	ooooo
	xxxxx	xxooooo	ooooo
	xxxxx	ooooo	
	xxxxx	oooo	
	xxxxx		
Enjoys writing	xxxxxooooo	xxxxxooooo	ooooo
	xxxxxooooo	xxxxxooooo	oo
	xxxxxoooo	xxxxooooo	
	xxxxx	ooooo	
	xxxxx	ooooo	
	xxxxx	ooooo	
	xxxxx	o	
	xxx		
Chooses to write	xxxxxooooo	xxxxxooooo	ooooo
	xxxxxooooo	xxxxxooooo	o
	xxxxxooooo	xooooo	
	xxxxxooooo	ooooo	
	xxxxxo	ooooo	
	xxxxx		
	xxxxx		
	xxxxx		
	x		
Attitude to learning	xxxxxooooo	xxxxxooooo	xxxxooooo
	xxxxxo	xxxxxooooo	ooooo
	xxxxx	xxxxxooooo	ooooo
	xxxxx	xxxxxooooo	o
	xxxxx	xxxooooo	
	xxx	ooooo	
		ooo	
Self-image	xxxxxooooo	xxxxxooooo	xxxooooo
	xxxxxoo	xxxxxooooo	ooooo
	xxxxx	xxxxxooooo	ooooo
	xxxxx	xxxxxooooo	
	xxxxx	xxxooooo	
	x	ooooo	

x = Pre, o = Post *Not all teachers responded to all items.

Table 4. Changes in Affect and Attitude Over the Course of the Field Study (1) (Pre - Post).

	L - L	L - M	L - H	M - L	M - M	M - H	H - H
Enjoys reading	4	20	8		9	12	2
Chooses to read	4	23	8		6	11	1
Enjoys writing	14	18	6		13	1	
Chooses to write	21	15	4		9	2	
Attitude - learning	5	20	4	1	13	8	5
Self-image	5	16	5	2	15	7	3

L = Low
M = Medium
H = High

(1) Four to seven months depending on time of entry into study

Ohio Project (1991-92) Results

Findings

To make a decision about a project such as the CONSULT-I (R) Reading Ohio Project, it is necessary to look at both process and product (Farr & Carey, p. 3) -- to look at how well the program functioned as well as what it produced, i.e., the success of the learners. Therefore, both program and learners were assessed. The following presents the findings of that assessment.

Program. The program assessment questionnaire which was completed by the teachers in May 1992 produced the following comments about the first workshop (September 20, 1991). Most of the teachers (83%) suggested that the workshop should be held in August rather than mid-September in order to give more time for planning. They also suggested that the goals of the program needed to be clearer and more time spent on the various forms (anecdotal records, matrices, and learner profiles). Some of them (2) also desired more time spent explaining the strategies. (Questions 1 & 2)

Comments received about changes in the taxonomy reflected a misunderstanding by several teachers of the processes of building the taxonomy and using it to obtain learner profiles. Suggestions included simplifying the taxonomy so the child could answer it. [Note: The taxonomy is not designed for use by the learner. CONSULT-I (R) is an expert system and therefore the taxonomy was designed to be answered by the teacher, a parent, or other knowledgeable adult.] One teacher did suggest that the child's last year's teacher could help complete the profile. Another felt that direct parent input would be helpful.

Another suggestion was to include more questions about families. [Note: Many such questions were included in earlier versions of the taxonomy, but later deleted because they did not prove significant in discriminating between high and low success learners.] There was also concern expressed about including more questions about non-traditional family structures [Note: Feature 25 is concerned with family structure. See Appendix C.]. One teacher did suggest that the child's last year's teacher could help complete the profile. Another felt that direct parent input would be helpful. Several teachers (9) thought the taxonomy was fine as it stood. (Question 3)

A large percentage (92%) of the teachers felt the project made them more aware of the learner's needs and interests. Two teachers noted they were aware of interests and needs early in the year. They commented that they were more focussed both in their teaching (96%) and on specific needs and interests. Two teachers stated that they had had to vary their approach to reading. (Questions 4 & 6)

Most of the teachers (71%) felt that the recommendations were appropriate for their learners. The other 29% felt they were somewhat appropriate. One teacher wrote, "After trying different techniques, I could tell that the recommendations were appropriate." Another stated, "I applied the recommended strategies and got positive results."

There was also some misunderstanding of the recommendations reflected in the comments by a few of the teachers. For example, one teacher commented, "It provided the resources, curriculum necessary to strengthen learner needs, weaknesses." [Note: The recommendations are meant to give the teacher guidance in finding the most efficient and effective way to success for a learner. They do not necessarily describe or pinpoint learner weakness or need. For example, a learner may need better self esteem, but the recommendation may not necessarily be self-concept enhancement but might be any of the other seven possibilities.] (Question 5)

There was a great variation in the amount of time spent by the teachers on CONSULT-I (R) recommendations. The range of time per week was from 5 minutes per learner to 12 hours. Several teachers found it difficult to assess the amount of time as the recommendations were incorporated into the regular classroom program and used with the entire class. (Question 7)

Many different responses were elicited by the question. "What have you done differently....?" These included:

*children making individual books
*children interacting with each other more
*teacher focussing on self esteem issues
*teacher focussing on specific learners
*children making games
*children more involved in learning
*teacher listened more to answers of children
*children got library cards
*teacher implemented strategies sooner and more consistently
*teacher worked with small group

(Question 8)

A majority (58%) of the teachers found it easy to implement the recommendations. Some (39%) found it somewhat difficult. Time appeared to be the greatest concern. Some teachers asked if they might implement the recommended strategies with the entire class. (Question 9)

Responses by teachers on a Likert Scale of 1 to 5 (1 - agree, 5 - disagree), as reflected in Table XX, show that 66% of the teachers felt the CONSULT-I (R) recommendations

are practical for classroom use. Twenty-one percent of the teachers seemed to be neutral while 13% disagreed somewhat. (Question 10)

Using the same scale, 71% of the teachers thought the support of the RPC staff was helpful and 62% found the site visits/inservices helpful. One fourth of the teachers appeared neutral about RPC staff support and 1 teacher disagreed somewhat. Approximately one fifth (21%) of the teachers seemed neutral about the site visits/inservices and 17% did not find them helpful. (Questions 11 & 12)

The majority of the teachers found the strategy booklet useful (80%), the explanations easy to understand (79%), and the examples easy to implement (75%). Twelve percent apparently did not think the strategy booklet was useful, eight percent seemed to find the explanations somewhat difficult, and four percent thought the examples were somewhat difficult to implement. (Questions 13, 14, & 15)

There was a wide range of responses to the statement "The best part of the CONSULT-I (R) Reading Project is ...." These included:

*individualized
*extra attention received by children
*the strategies
*seeing the success of the learner
*seeing my students' self-esteem grow
*meeting and sharing with colleagues
*exchanging ideas
*working closely with a small group
*being able to use more than one strategy.

(Question 16)

When questioned about the weakest part of the project. The teachers noted:

*time needed for strategies
*time involved in record keeping
*more time needed to understand process
*vocabulary (terminology)
*need to start earlier in year
*clarification needed on program goals
*taxonomy

(Question 17)

-- responses which will be useful in the next project implementation.

When asked what they had learned from their experience with the project, the teachers' answers fell for the most part into three categories: new techniques, focus, and awareness of individual learners. Within the new techniques

category, teachers made comments such as:

*I got several different ideas for creative reading teaching
*I have learned many techniques
*It sharpened my tactics for teaching reading.

The focus category included comments on instruction such as:

*I learned to focus more on self-esteem issues
*To focus on certain areas
*How to better focus instruction.

Most of the teachers, responses came in the third category, awareness:

*More aware of looking at each student
*More conscious of individual reactions
*More awareness of what the children...needed.

Other statements outside of these categories included:

*How to involve reluctant pupils
*Practice with anecdotal records
*There are many things that influence a child's ability to read.

(Question 19)

The last section of the program assessment questionnaire asked teachers to respond to the individual goals they had set at the workshop on September 20. Most of the goals concerned learning new techniques while a few teachers were interested in raising the level of their learners in academics and confidence. Two teachers were looking for new materials while one teacher wanted to help her students "enjoy picking up a book to read for sheer pleasure." Representative responses to these goals include the following statements:

*Pupils chose books that interested them. Pupils voluntarily read more, made wiser choices when selecting books.
*They were more willing to try. They felt a part of the group for they were making contributions.
*I do more things in reading that are interesting to the children. In many cases my children understood more when they were interested in a topic.
*I have learned to vary my approach to reading. By mixing strategies it keeps my teaching fresh and the children like doing "different" things in reading. Also weak areas in a student can be strengthened by using multiple strategies.
*Teaching reading has definitely been harder as far as

time is concerned. It takes more time to prepare but the results seem to show improvement when a child is motivated.

*First we have to break through the barriers of environment and family strife. CONSULT-I (R) Reading helped me do this. They directed me to such things as interest, games, language experience, functional language, motivation, and self-concept. Once you have broken the barriers, you can now slowly teach in a more efficient way.

*The learners came to know success and how to attain it. There is a joy in knowing and seeing the changes that you can bring to the lives of your students.

*I tried each day to have my students experience success.

*I have read daily - sometimes twice daily to my students. At first, even though they were interested, their attention span was extremely short. They will now sit listening for 20 minutes and want more. We practice SSR (silent sustained reading) and have had the same positive change.

Learner. Progress made by the learners in the CONSULT-I (R) Reading program is measured by changes in affect, attitude, and overall success, changes which the Reading Practicum Center instructors and students have observed usually precede major changes in the academic progress of troubled readers. Samples of the criteria used for rating these changes are shown in Tables 1 (affect), 2 (attitude), and 3 (success). The changes, categorized into three groups--high, medium, and low,--are now verified through The OA.

TABLE 1
Criteria and Examples for Changes in Affect

High*	Very positive feelings at end of program, many times demonstrated by complete reversal
	Ex: September - quiet, shy
	May - has come out of shell, enjoys participating
	Ex: September - strong willed, moody
	May - very happy, high self-esteem, more cooperative
	Ex: September - quiet, hesitant, fidgety
	May - confident in her abilities, loves to hear stories
Medium	More positive feelings at end of program, still room to grow
	Ex: September - little emotion
	May - more pride in work
	Ex: September - very quiet, not eager
	May - more relaxed, enjoys class
	Ex: September - immature, seeks approval
	May - eager to share, wavering self-esteem
Low	Feelings have changed little or not at all, usually negative
	Ex: September - unhappy, quarrelsome
	May - still down on self, immature
	Ex: September - bored, little interest
	May - becomes bored
	Ex: September - introverted
	May - shy, hesitant, makes up stories

*The learners who began and ended the program with high affect were rated high.

The examples in Tables 1 and 2 were extracted from statements made by the learner's teacher on the Affect, Attitude, Success Matrix at the beginning (September), middle (end of January), and end of the program (May). The teachers had been instructed in the use of the matrix at the workshop in September with further instruction given during the November inservices. The ratings of high, medium, and low affect and attitude changes were made in May by the RPC staff after receiving the final matrix entry from the teachers.

TABLE 2
Criteria and Examples for Changes in Attitude

High*	Very positive outlook at end of program, often demonstrated by complete reversal
	Ex. September - generally negative
	May - very positive, knows he can be successful
	Ex. September - never volunteers, "shrinks" in her seat
	May - positive, proud of herself and her work
	Ex. September - attempts to do work
	May - goal is to make the honor roll
Medium	More positive outlook at end of program, still room to grow
	Ex. September - not motivated, "do we have to?"
	May - motivated more, takes more of a part in activities
	Ex. September - avoids reading
	May - tries harder, fears failure less
	Ex. September - does not read on his own
	May - more positive reading attitude
Low	Attitude has changed little or not at all, usually negative
	Ex. September - goes with the flow
	May - "I don't care"
	Ex. September - generally negative unless interested
	May - mixed
	Ex. September - does not participate
	May - seems to have lost all interest in school

*The learners who began and ended the program with high attitude were rated high.

TABLE 3
Criteria for Success

High	The learner who has shown high success will have made significant progress in his/her academic achievement. For example, he/she will now be reading on a higher level than in September and/or have a higher grade in reading on the report card.
Medium	The learner will have made progress in the classroom but it will not necessarily be reflected in a higher reading level or grades. It will be based on teacher observation and may include positive changes in affect and attitude.
Low	The learner will have made little or no progress in the classroom.

Since the rating for success includes not only the entries on the Affect, Attitude, Success Matrix (Tables 1 and 2) but year long observation as well, it was deemed more appropriate to ask the teachers to rate overall success. They were given the criteria for success checksheets at the last inservice. The teachers were asked to rate their learners and enter the ranking on the learner assessment

questionnaire which was returned to the RPC in May.

Changes in affect and attitude, and overall success in the Ohio project are shown in Table 4. Fifty percent of the learners showed a great or high change in affect and 35% a medium change making a total of 85% with a positive change. Little or no change (low) was shown by 15% of the learners. High changes in attitude were shown by 38% and medium changes by 46% for a total of 84% showing positive changes. Sixteen percent showed little or no change. Twenty-nine percent achieved high overall success, 55% medium, and 16% made little or no progress.

TABLE 4
Affect, Attitude, Success

	High	Medium	Low
Affect	55 (50%)	39 (35%)	17 (15%)
Attitude	42 (38%)	51 (46%)	18 (16%)
Success	32 (29%)	61 (55%)	18 (16%)

Further analysis by CLS showed that a positive change in both attitude and affect led to over 95% probability of high or medium success. If, on the other hand, there was little or no change in attitude and affect, then there was only about a 50% chance of high or medium success.

One question on the Learner Assessment Questionnaire which the teachers completed at the end of the project asked if the teachers felt the CONSULT-I (R) Reading program had made a difference to that learner. They were then asked to describe the difference. For 83 (75%) of the 111 learners in the program at the end of the year the teachers felt the program had made a difference. Representative comments made are as follows:

*He was excited about reading and I feel these activities motivated him
*She has more confidence, often volunteering to read aloud or answer questions
*He is able to find books of interest in the library with little guidance. His sense of curiosity has also expanded
*I believe that the extra attention made her feel "special" and helped motivate her

*Without the use of this program, this student's skill level would be lower than it is now.
*This learner is much more cooperative and more motivated in reading.

For the other 28 (25%) learners the teachers felt that the program had either made no difference or they were not sure if it had made a difference. Reasons for this included poor attendance, family problems, learning disabilities, or the teachers had always included these activities in their curriculum.

Standardized test scores were also analyzed for those learners whose pre and post scores were available. Although standardized test scores often become an accepted "final" measure of learner progress, it should be noted, as the results of standardized testing for the Ohio progect are reviewed, that the results of three different tests are presented across the five school districts: CAT, MAT, and CTBS. The data in some schools are incomplete due to family moves, absences, or to children entering late to replace children who dropped out.

The Normal Curve Equivalent Scale (NCE) was used to represent learner scores on the standardized tests. It is the scale used by Ohio districts and we were requested to use it by a district evaluator. Although the NCE (normal curve equivalent) scale is required for federally funded programs such as Chapter I and was thereby adopted for Ohio's Disadvantaged Pupil Program Fund, it is important to note that some researchers consider its use dubious:

> (it) is an ill-conceived normalized scale used in the evaluation of certain federally funded programs. The NCE scale has mean of 50 and standard deviation of 21; the NCE usit is 1/98 of the distance between the 1st and 99th percentiles, expressed in z-score units. (Glass and Hopkins, 1984, p. 67, footnote c)

The following tables show the average pre and post test scores of the learners overall and by school (Table 5) and by grade level (Table 6).

TABLE 5
Average Pre and Post Test Scores Overall and By School

School	N	Vocabulary		Comprehension		Total Reading	
		Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
1	23	34.5	40.2	29.9	40.0	32.5	39.5
2	24	32.6	35.8	42.1	34.4	34.0	32.0
3	15	53.1	38.1	47.2	36.1	50.0	36.7
4	20	41.8	46.7	41.9	42.1	40.6	42.0
5	18	37.7	38.0	38.7	39.1	35.8	36.4
All	100	38.9	39.8	39.4	38.3	37.7	37.2

TABLE 6
Average Pre and Post Test Scores By Grade Level

Grade	N	Vocabulary		Comprehension		Total Reading	
		Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post
1	30	32.3	36.8	39.5	34.9	31.8	32.4
2	31	36.0	39.9	33.5	39.7	34.5	37.8
3	15	40.2	42.7	38.7	42.9	38.5	42.1
4	16	52.0	37.4	48.4	40.2	50.2	38.5
5	8	46.0	49.5	45.5	33.1	45.5	41.4

Overall results of the standardized test scores do not show significant change in most categories. In some of the categories the average was skewed by a high pre test score for an individual (for example, 90) which on the post test fell to a considerably lower score (34). In many instances individual scores were found to swing greatly in both positive and negative directions. One must question the circumstances surrounding such changes and the reliability of these scores.

But the individualized outcome analysis facility of The OA or CLS can investigate these individual swings in relationship to the individual pupil. We found that CLS trained with Ohio records is able to predict for an individual pupil a positive or negative change in standardized test scores with an accuracy of 84%. Further examples of results from such individualized outcome analysis are as follows:

The probability of a positive change in standardized test score is:

8% higher if the pupil has strengths in comprehension 'AND' creativity.

17% higher if the pupil has strengths in comprehension 'AND' creativity 'AND' curiosity.

33% higher if the pupil has strengths in comprehension 'AND' creativity 'AND' curiosity 'AND' listening level 'AND' self-concept 'AND' attitude.

Thus individualized outcome analysis using The OA or CLS was able to look at the individual pupil and glean insight not possible from an analysis of average change in standardized test scores.

We need not take a position as to the merit of standardized test scores for the individual pupil. Rather, standardized test scores can be viewed as but one of many indicators of pupil performance. Individualized Outcome Analysis (TM) using CLS or The OA with their capacity to accommodate such multiple measures is thus much more powerful than any single criterion such as standardized test scores.

CLS can predict an individualized outcome of standardized test scores. CONSULT-I suggests the most likely-to-succeed individualized reading strategy for the pupil. This capacity to predict both outcomes on standardized test scores and most effective strategy thus become a double-barreled approach to individualizing student instruction. This similar ability of CONSULT-I and CLS for prediction is not a coincidence, but a reflection of the power of the new method to individualize reading help to the pupil.

A conclusion is that standardized test scores can remain as part of the criteria for evaluating pupil achievement but only as part of the individualized outcome analysis of CONSULT.

In addition, given the recent pronouncement by the National Education Association regarding standardized tests,

> The National Education Association voted Wednesday to oppose statewide or national standardized testing, reversing earlier support.
>
> The 8,500 delegates to a meeting of the nation's largest teachers' union overwhelmingly adopted a resolution against "standardized testing that is mandated by a state or a national authority" and the "use of these tests to compare one school or district to another."

> Instead, NEA officials said other forms of testing academic achievements of students should be used, such as requiring students to collect schoolwork in various subjects in portfolios... (Henry, Tamara, NEA votes..., AP Wire Service as quoted in Indiana Daily Student, 7/9/92, p.3.)

caution should be exercised.

A majority of the CONSULT Project children showed positive gains in affect and attitude. Such gains harbinger future progress in academic pursuits. To place undue emphasis on the standardized test scores at this time may result in a short sighted evaluation of the true outcomes. Our assessment suggests the need, rather, to continue the individualized instruction these children have received in order to assure their continued progress.

Data analysis. Preliminary results in November of the Leave-One-Out test showed the test record's category (strategy recommendation) agreeing with the impartial decision as follows:

*top category	84% (experimental error 16%)
*top two categories	94% (experimental error 6%)
*top three categories	99% (experimental error 1%).

These results demonstrated that the Ohio database clustered well when trained by the Indiana database. At the end of the project, the test was run again including those learners who were added to the program before the end of January. The categories clustered with an accuracy of 95%.

The data analysis carried out by Dr. Patrick at the end of the project included the use of The OA using affect and attitude and revealed some important findings (see Table 7), especially in response to questions posed by legislators in January 1991 concerning ethnic background and family structure. Afro-American learners actually displayed a higher probability of success (.89) than Caucasians (.81) in the CONSULT-I (R) Reading program. Learners from both single parent households and traditional households have an equal probability of success (.88). The probability of success does fall off when the learner is living with other family members (.77) although the chance of success is still high.

It is interesting to note that the two cities in which the most resistant teachers participated had the lowest probabilities of success (Cleveland, .71, and Toledo, .78). The other three cities had extremely high rates of success (.91, Cincinnati and Columbus, and .92, Akron). Apparently, teacher affect and attitude does affect the outcome of the learners.

TABLE 7

Some Predictors of Success (High/Medium)

Feature	Value	Probability of Success
Grade level	1	.87
	2	.89
	3	.87
	4	.80
	5	.78
Ethnic background	Afro-American	.89
	Asian	1.00
	Caucasian	.81
	Hispanic	.75
Family structure	Single parent	.88
	Traditional	.88
	Living w/other family member	.77
City	Akron	.92
	Cincinnati	.91
	Cleveland	.71
	Columbus	.91
	Toledo	.78
Mother's education	Less than 8th	1.00
	9th through less than 12th	.90
	HS diploma or GED	.80
	Some college, vocational, etc	1.00
	College degree	1.00

Discussion

Program. The broad goal of CONSULT-I (R) Reading is to help teachers **focus** their instruction through the recommendations for individual learners so that the instruction is more **efficient** and **effective**, and that each learner has the greatest chance of **success**. This goal seems to have been met as evidenced by the findings presented in the previous section.

The majority of participating Ohio teachers seemed positive about the CONSULT-I (R) Reading Ohio Project. Not only did they feel that it made a difference to their learners, but they also reported that it made a difference in their total awareness of their learners and, for many of them, in their teaching.

Again and again teachers mentioned both at inservices

and on the program assessment questionnaire that the recommendations did help them focus their instruction. The focus was on both specific strategies and specific learners. Many of them commented that this was a different approach than they had used previously.

That instruction guided by the CONSULT-I (R) Reading recommendations is more efficient and effective is well shown in the testimony given by one first grade teacher both in the preface to this report and here.

> The proof for me ... was in the recommendations I received for Julius after the program was over. [Note: the teacher received recommendations after the program was over to validate her instructional decisions during the semester.] I have anquished over this child most of the year trying to reach him and love him and by March was finally able to begin making significant progress with him. We're on a roll now and we're making up for a lost 6 months in a short time.
>
> I believe the year would have been different if I'd had the specific strategies and the technology to "focus" my attention (sooner).

The program does save the teacher time in finding the strategy which brings success to the learner most efficiently and effectively. This saving, if recognized in light of current proposals to lengthen the school year, suggests that making better use of the time we already have may be an effective and efficient first step in achieving quality education for all.

Not all teachers found the program easy to use at first. Time seemed a difficult taskmaster for many of them until they realized that many of the suggestions were as appropriate for their whole class as for the CONSULT-I (R) children. They then found that incorporating the recommendations in their curriculum for their whole class made it possible. Two teachers did appear to have personality or teaching characteristics which made it difficult to implement the recommended strategies to carry out the program successfully. One, following a highly structured curriculum, seemed unwilling to make any changes. The other seemed overwhelmed by the situation and noted on the questionnaire,

> The program has potential but is not easily implemented when other factors are considered. These other factors are: wide variations in ability levels and the constant discipline wars that complicate practical implementation.
> Lack of parental support with low level kids is another problem.

This teacher was also extremely concerned with covering the prescribed curriculum.

Those teachers who found the program easy to implement appeared to be the ones who were willing to try many of the strategies or were open to suggestions and eager to make changes in their classroom. They seemed hungry for new ideas. One said at the last inservice, "We never have a chance to meet or discuss ideas for our teaching. I'd like to know what's going on 'out there.'"

As the year progressed some basic misunderstanding of the program surfaced (see Findings: Program). These included the misapprehension on the part of some teachers that it would be desirable to have the learner answer the taxonomy questions; the suggestion that more questions about the family should be included; and the perception that the recommendations were an identification of learner weakness (which they are not) rather than the pinpointing of a most-likely-to-succeed strategy, <u>because</u> such a strategy has been successful with learners in the CONSULT-I (R) Reading database having similar characteristics. Another misconception advanced in the assessments by two teachers was that the recommendations were related to learning styles or modalities.

These problems might be attributed to two circumstances connected with the first workshop: the date of the workshop, September 20; and the abundance of concepts needing to be absorbed in one day. The date of the workshop dictated by the timing of contract negotiations, several weeks after the beginning of school, made it necessary for teachers to plunge into the project immediately with the "how-to" becoming more important than the basic concepts. Holding the workshop in August, as recommended by most of the teachers, would help alleviate this problem.

CONSULT-I (R) Reading does introduce several concepts that might be unfamiliar to or not used by the teachers regularly:

*expert system
*taxonomy (including concepts contained within some of the questions)
*assessment of learner affect and attitude
*anecdotal records
*relation of the recommendation to the learner.

A one day workshop simply may not be enough to thoroughly present or absorb what is needed at the beginning of the program.

Some misconceptions were cleared up in the 3 subsequent inservices held at each school (November, January, and March/April). Others, unfortunately, were still present at the end of the project.

One interesting and unexpected bonus of the project was the interaction of the teachers during the workshop and inservices. As mentioned earlier the teachers seemed hungry for new ideas. They greatly appreciated the time to share and learn "what is going on out there." Several of them commented that the regular school day with all its requirements did not allow for such interaction.

The sharing during the inservice meetings apparently led to more sharing between the meetings. A 29 year teacher noted during a site visit that he had noticed some good things happening in the classroom next door. He had asked that teacher how he might involve his class in the same things. This was a new event for that veteran teacher.

There is one important item that is not directly reflected in the questionnaire. As the classrooms were visited throughout the year, growth was noted not only in the learners but also in their teachers. During a classroom visit in March, one teacher asked to speak with the observer. The teacher said,

> This program is weird. I didn't know the children that well when I completed their profiles in the Fall, but all of the recommendations are on target. I know I am an 'old-fashinoned' teacher. I want you to help me be more 'modern.'

Other instances of teacher growth and change were noted. Learning in classrooms seemed to be more joyful and loving, progress charts climbed across walls and up to ceilings, and learner products were more in evidence.

Learner. In his discussion of the affective domain of reading, Strickler states,

> The somewhat deplorable state of American's reading habits is undoubtedly the result of many factors operating within our society. Perhaps one of the most significant of these factors is the emphasis our schools have traditionally placed on teaching children how to read. And, while few people would deny the importance of teaching children how to read, children also need to learn why they should read;.... (p. 1).
>
> What is needed is a reallocation of the emphasis in teaching reading; a shifting of perspective so that we keep clearly in mind the reason why we teach people how to read: so that they will want to read (p. 2).

The broad goal of CONSULT-I (R) Reading with respect to

the learner is to help him/her **enjoy** reading (change in affect), **want** to read (change in attitude), and, thus, become a **better reader** (success). Most of the learners who participated in the CONSULT-I (R) Reading Ohio Project have come to enjoy reading more (85%), have either developed or begun to develop a positive attitude toward reading (84%) and have become better readers (84%). (See Table 4.)

The staff at the RPC received the following letter in March from a third grader who was a participant in the program that illustrates the above.

> Dear Indiana,
>
> I think reading is very nice. I haved thought reading was going to be boring. **But now I know it is fun to read. I hope you know that we have to know we need reading.** My favorite book is Clifford's Manners. That is a nice story. I have leared to read more. I go home and read every day. Thanks you for your help.
>
> Your friend,
>
> [Note: Bold inserted by editor.]

As mentioned above as we have worked with troubled readers we have seen that a progression from affective to attitudinal to overall change in literacy achievement occurred. Affective changes often signaled attitudinal changes. These two "A" changes often preceded changes in overall success in reading. The evaluation of this Ohio Project is significant in that it documents this process of change and makes clear the relationship between change in feelings (affect) and attitude and change in academic achievement.

Going back to Table 4, it can be seen by looking down the High Change column that 50% of the learners showed a high change in affect (the first step) while only 38% had a high change in attitude (the second step) and 29% in success (the third step). It can further be seen from the CLS analysis that learners who had positive changes in affect and attitude had a much greater chance of success (95%+) while those who had little or no change had only a 50% chance of success. Both of these findings support the Reading Practicum Center premise that positive affect and attitude changes precede and accompany success.

Teachers commented in the cases of three fourths of the learners who were in the program at the end of the project that CONSULT-I (R) Reading had made a difference to the learner in affect, attitude and overall success. This appears to be an excellent result considering the fact that all of these learners had problems in reading at the beginning of the program and the regular school program had apparently not been able to reach them. In some of the

remaining cases teachers were unsure as to the effect the program had on the learner because so many factors had entered into the final results. In a few cases teachers felt the program had not made a difference usually due to factors outside of the school including home problems, learner immaturity, and absence.

While standardized test scores can be helpful in making decisions about learners and programs, they should be considered as only one part of the entire process. It also should be remembered that these scores only measure part of the reading process. In Reading: What can be measured?, Farr and Carey state:

> To determine if tests actually measure reading, we must first ask: What is reading? If reading is defined as an activity in which human beings engage themselves for specific reasons as part of their everyday lives, the answer to the first question is "No!" At best, tests can provide some indication of how someone reads, but the relationship of such indications to actual reading behaviors must be inferred. Despite what one often reads in research articles, reading is not what reading tests test....
>
> It must be understood that tests are activities to engage examinees in behaviors that are like what they do in everyday life. But tests are not reality. The testing conditions, the purposes for reading, the examinee's attitude toward tests (and even toward school) all influence test preformance. (p. 16)

Thus, the writers of this report feel that the scores as presented in Tables 5 and 6 give only a part of the whole and should not be given undue emphasis but rather considered as one indicator among many.

The decision to initiate the Ohio Project without a control group was a conscious decision based on budget. The grant did not permit funding for a control group. However, it should be remembered that each of the 25 teachers who did participate in the project were invited to include five learners most needing special attention in reading who were not already participating in other special reading programs. And, when the direction to fund the project had come from the Ohio Legislature, it had been with the understanding that we were to work with "...some of the toughest educational settings in Ohio." Therefore, positive results with children from these "toughest settings" is significant even though at this time it is not measured against a control group.

Data analysis. The fact that the categories clustered well for the top two recommendations (95%) leads to the inference that the Indiana database can be applied to other populations such as the Ohio learners. [Note: The learners also cluster well by city.]

The features that were analyzed as predictors of success were chosen only as samples as deadlines made it impossible to analyze each feature of the taxonomy. Ethnic background and family structure were chosen in response to questions of Ohio legislators as to whether the program would be successful with learners from various ethnic backgrounds and types of households. Results (see Table 7) demonstrate the fact that CONSULT-I (R) Reading is successful for both Afro-Americans and Caucasians. It was also shown that in this program learners from single parent homes have as great a chance of success as those from traditional homes.

Learners in the primary grades (1, 2, & 3) appear to have a slightly greater chance of success (approximately 10%) in the CONSULT-I (R) Reading program than those in the upper elementary grades. This supports the theory held by many educators and supported by the experience of the RPC staff that the younger the learner is, the easier it is to make a difference.

Conclusions and Recommendations

One of the few First Grade Studies not included in the final reports of Bond and Dykstra (1967) was that of the Cedar Rapids, IA, collaboration between the Cedar Rapids Community Schools and the University of Iowa (Reid and Beltramo, 1965). It was not included because it dealt with the lower third of the first grade children enrolled in the 51 first grades in Cedar Rapids in 1964-65. The other 26 First Grade Studies dealt with methodology of teaching reading for the whole spectrum of first graders, not just the lower third. Yet, it is the lower third of the children, typically known as the "low group," who struggle with reading and who often drop out when it is legal to do so. These are the children who comprise the sample in the current project, children nominated by their teachers as middle or low group and generally not part of other special programs who would profit from special, targeted assistance in reading. For this reason, it is meaningful to revisit Newman's longitudinal work (1978, 1980, 1985) from which several of the features of the current CONSULT-I (R) Reading taxonomy for K-12 were drawn. Model, motivation, interest, and positive pressure, variables identified in the Cedar Rapids research to have predictive significance in the academic achievements of children originally classified as low group, survived the winnowing process in the course of the six year (1983 - 1989) refinement of the taxonomy and

have come to be included in the final 20 features with which we started the Ohio project.

It is in the application of these variables (model, motivation, interest, and positive pressure) through the recommendations of CONSULT-I (R) Reading that the program in Ohio was successful -- model in strategies such as silent sustained reading (SSR), motivation in strategies such as progress charts, interest in strategies such as learner choice of reading material, and positive pressure in strategies such as sharing with others.

Program. The program appears to work best with teachers who are flexible, open, and willing to vary instruction to meet the needs of individual children. As we got to know the teachers, for example, it was obvious that many eagerly applied the recommended strategies, and even asked if it were permissable to use the strategies with their whole class as well. One first grade teacher, thrilled with the strategy recommendations dovetailing with a course she was taking at a nearby university, said, "I'll never go back to how I used to teach."

By contrast a teacher in another school, visibly resistant, as shown in body language and verbal and written comments, summarized her reactions to the program by saying, "I was disappointed in the lack of innovative recommendations. There was nothing in the project strategies that could not be found in any basal reader teacher's manual." Unfortunately, this teacher did not realize that the strategies, though not always new (though many teachers expressed graditude for the new strategies they learned), are powerful because strategies are matched to a particular individual.

The qualities of openness, flexibility, and eagerness to try new ideas were not necessarily a function of teaching experience. The first teacher quoted above had 26 years of experience. The second quote also came from an experienced teacher with 16 years of experience. But, how different they were in personality and teaching approach.

We have recognized for years, and it was brought out once again in the First Grade Studies and the Ohio project, that teacher quality makes the difference in a classroom. Yet, we have been reluctant or unwilling to do the teacher training and sifting necessary to achieve top quality teachers for the children most in need. Often the least experienced teachers are assigned to the most in-need learners.

The generally positive responses of teachers in the Ohio project suggest several conclusions:

*CONSULT- I (R) Reading does provide an efficient, cost-effective teacher training program for dealing with troubled readers.
"I learned many new ideas"
"I am more aware of different techniques"

*It provides teachers with reinforcement for many of methods with which they are already familiar, but does this in such a focussed way as to enable them to move more quickly to make application of appropriate strategies.
"Just sharpened and streamlined the ones I had previously used"

*It provides teachers with a truly individualized approach to teaching reading, which is flexible and often appropriate for whole class application.
"After I implemented the strategies with the whole class, it became easier."
"I've done most of the activities with groups or the whole class but would focus in with specific strategies you recommended."

*Teacher, as well as learner, affect, attitude, and overall success with teaching appear to have a marked influence on learner achievement. Teachers, who might be characterized as positive, upbeat, enthusiastic, joyous, verbal, and loving, saw positive growth in the children who participated in the CONSULT-I (R) Reading program.
By contrast, teachers who might be characterized as doubters, insecure, entrenched in methodology or disorganized did not achieve as positive results.

*It takes a well organized teacher to fulfill the spirit as well as the letter of the CONSULT-I (R) Reading recommendations as time constraints challenged many teachers.

*Regular communication is a must for a successful project. Inservices were crucial to the success of the program and would even be preferable more often if affordable.
The newsletters afforded a positive means of sharing teacher successes.

Teacher suggestions and Reading Practicum Center staff observations also led to some strong conclusions and recommendations:

*More time is needed at the beginning of the year to train teachers to use the various strategies. Some professed to understanding what was implied by the strategy descriptions, but when it came to

implementing the strategies, great variance in quality was found.
The initial workshop should be two days instead of the one day scheduled in 1991.

*Teachers within the Urban Demonstration Schools who participated this year (with a few exceptions) would be suitable instructors within their own schools if carefully supported by RPC staff.

*Great care is needed in explaining the taxonomy, its derivation, and interpretation of the resulting recommendations.

Learners. Conclusions regarding CONSULT-I (R) learners in the Ohio project include the following:

*The application of CONSULT-I (R) Reading strategies is generally beneficial and appropriate in teaching inner city children in Ohio how and why to read.

*Positive changes in affect and attitude do signal change in the overall academic progress.

*Application of the CONSULT-I (R) Reading strategies led to a variety of strategies being tried with the children.

*Ethnic background and family structure do not significantly affect a learner's success in the CONSULT-I (R) Reading program.

Learners in the Ohio project, although identifiably associated with different racial and family characteristics, are essentially children who respond positively to instruction geared specifically to their needs and interests and presented through strategies which have proven successful with learners having essentially similar characteristics.

Even when confronted with seemingly insurmountable home situations, the learners responded favorably to the recommended strategies, demonstrated remarkable changes in affect and attitude and generally posted modestly positive results on standardized tests when able teachers overcame the barriers through the CONSULT-I (R) program.

Despite the demands of implementation, this approach embodies the precepts of the scientific method to education, i.e.

* data based

* statistical pattern recognition
* expert system.

It is within these precepts that both teachers and learners were able to grow this past year as they participated in the CONSULT-I (R) Reading Ohio Project. Teachers were able to efficiently identify those strategies which would be most effective so there learners would have the greatest chance of success. Learners came to enjoy reading, wanted to read, and became better readers.

The broad goals of CONSULT-I (R) Reading in the Ohio project, as listed below, were met.

1. To help teachers focus their instruction through the recommendations for individual learners so that the instruction is more efficient and effective, and that each learner has the greatest chance of success.

2. To help the learner enjoy reading (affect), to want to read (attitude), and thus become a better reader (success).

References

Bond, G. L. & Dykstra, R. (1967). The cooperative research program in first grade reading instruction. Reading Research Quarterly, XI (4), 5 - 141.

Farr, R. & Carey, R. F. (1986). Reading: What can be measured? Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Glass, G. V. & Hopkins, K. D. (1984). Statistical methods in education and psychology. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Newman, A.P. (1978). Twenty lives: A longitudinal study of the effects of 5 variables on the lives of 20 students who were low readiness in first grade (1964-1976). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University.

Newman, A. P. (1980). Twenty lives revisited: A longitudinal study of the impact of literacy on the occupations and schooling of students who were low reading readiness in first grade (1964-1978) - with special attention to model, motivation, interest, perseverance, and pressure. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University.

Newman, A. P. (1985). Twenty lives nineteen years later: A longitudinal study (1964-1983) of the impact of

literacy on the occupations, schooling, and educational growth of young adults who were low=reading readiness in first grade with special attention given to model, motivation, interest, perseverance, and pressure as aspects of background and mental environment. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University.

Newman, A. P. & Metz, E. M. (1988). Individualizing language strategies using CONSULT-I (R). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Reading Practicum Center.

Patrick, E. A. (1972). Fundamentals of pattern recognition. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Patrick, E. A. & Fattu, J.M. (1986). Artificial intelligence with statistical pattern recognition. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Reid, H.C. & Beltramo, L. (1965). The effect of different approaches of initial instruction on the reading achievement of a selected group of first grade children. USOE Cooperative Research Project No. 2698. Cedar Rapids, IA: Cedar Rapids Community School District.

Strickler, D. J. (Ed.). (1977). The affective dimension of reading. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Publications.

Vinsonhaler, J.F., Weinshank, A.B., Wagner, C.C., & Polin, R.M. (Winter 1983). Diagnosing children with educational problems. Characteristics of reading and learning disabilities specialists, and classroom teachers. Reading Research Quarterly, 18 (2), 134 - 161.

CONSULT-I (R) READING CINCINNATI PROJECT

Spring Semester 1993

TIMELINE

February 5	All day workshop
February 19	Learner profiles due
February 26	Recommendations returned On site visit (morning) Inservice (after lunch) Recommendations Affect, attitude, success matrix
March 1	Begin implementation of recommendations
April 2	On site visit (morning) Inservice (after lunch) Response to questions
April 15	Affect, attitude, success matrix due Second entry
May 21	On site visit (morning) Inservice (after lunch) Assessment forms
June 10	Assessment forms due

Ohio Project (1991-92)

Methodology

The following section describes the methodology of the project as carried out through the 1991 - 1992 school year.

Teacher training. Throughout the development of the CONSULT-I (R) Reading program teacher training was recognized as a significant element. As one principal remarked after attending the January inservice, "There is a lot more teacher training in this than I thought." A workshop, on-site visits, inservices, and newsletters were used throughout the year to train the teachers in the use of CONSULT-I (R) Reading and its

recommendations. Both the project director and the research associate were involved in the training presentations and the responses to teacher questions and concerns. (See Appendix E for workshop and inservices agendas.)

All of the teachers were present at the initial workshop in Columbus, September 20, 1991. At this meeting the teachers were provided with a notebook which included the project timeline (Appendix F); CONSULT-I (R) Reading taxonomy (Appendices A and C); profile sheets (Appendix G); anecdotal record forms, revised in January 1992 (Appendix H); affect, attitude, success matrix (Appendix I); and a written statement concerning evaluation (Appendix J). The notebook also contained the strategy booklet, Individualizing Language Strategies Using CONSULT-I (R) (Newman & Metz, 1988). (See Appendix B.)

During the **September 20 workshop** the teachers were instructed in completion of the learner profiles which would be processed through CONSULT-I (R) Reading at the RPC and returned with recommendations for appropriate strategies. Suggestions were made for keeping anecdotal records for each learner which were to include activities carried out by the teacher and learner, and results of the activities. The affect, attitude, success matrix was discussed and the teachers were instructed to make entries at the beginning, middle, and end of the project for each learner. Edward Patrick, M.D., Ph.D., co-designer of the CONSULT-I (R) computer program, demonstrated the Reading subsystem.

The first edition of the CONSULT-I (R) Reading Ohio Project Newsletter was mailed on September 25. Later editions were sent in months when no inservices were held. (See Appendix K for all editions.)

During **November site visits and inservices** were held at each school: Cleveland, November 1; Akron, November 5; Toledo, November 12; Columbus, November 19; and Cincinnati, November 26. Each classroom participating in the project was observed during the morning for 15 to 30 minutes,

depending on class schedules, by the Project Director, Dr. Anabel Newman, and the RPC Research Associate, Elizabeth Metz.

The teachers met with the RPC personnel during the afternoon for an inservice of approximately one and a half hours in length. During this time teacher questions were answered; anecdotal records were discussed; a worksheet was used to help teachers categorize items for the affect, attitude, success matrix (Appendix L); and possible evaluation questions were talked about. Teachers were also given a color coded chart showing the recommendations for their learners (see Appendix M for sample). Unit Development Projects from the RPC were discussed in relation to actual recommendations for specific learners or groups of learners. These projects included language experience books, written and illustrated by a learner; a school picture book which included pictures of all school personnel with a brief interview which had been conducted and written by the learners; and some science projects which had been written and illustrated by learners to be shared with classmates. It was shown how one type of project could fulfill several different focus recommendations.

In **December** it was discovered that while the teachers were using the suggestions from the strategies booklet, they were not always choosing activities that were related to the recommendations for the individual learner. To help teachers keep the recommendations in mind a new anecdotal record form was designed (Appendix H). This was given to teachers during the January inservices. (For sample completed anecdotal records, see Appendix N.)

During **January** the schools in Akron (January 9), Cleveland (January 10), Columbus (January 24), and Cincinnati (January 31) were visited. Due to a snow storm the Toledo visit was postponed until February 14. Again in Akron and Cleveland the classrooms were observed in the morning and the teacher inservice was held in the afternoon. In Columbus the teacher inservice was held in the morning and there was no classroom observation due to a "snow day." The Toledo visit also only included a morning inservice as the teachers needed to be in their classroom for Valentines Day parties in the afternoon.

The inservice provided time for teacher questions, anecdotal record highlights (Appendix O) were discussed, the revised anecdotal record form was introduced, the use of art and music in reading was presented (Appendix P), and a curriculum built around chocolate which cut across the content areas (Appendix Q) was shared. Teachers were reminded that the second entry on the affect, attitude, success matrix should be made during January and a copy of the matrix sent to the RPC. It was also suggested to

teachers that if they had questions before the next inservice in April, they could drop us a postcard and we would call them.

The last set of site visits and inservices began on **March** 27 in Columbus. The Akron meeting was on April 2, Cleveland on April 3, Toledo on April 10, and Cincinnati on April 24. In Columbus and Akron the classrooms were visited in the morning and the inservices were held in the afternoon. The Cleveland inservice was held in the morning. There were no classroom visits as standardized tests were being administered. Due to the prediction of severe weather, the Toledo inservice was held in the morning and classrooms were not observed.

The inservice included a time for teachers to share highlights and learner products which were a result of the CONSULT- I (R) Reading project (see Appendix R for samples). The remainder of the inservice addressed year-end program and learner assessment. Each teacher was given a three page questionnaire relating to the CONSULT-I (R) Reading program (Appendix S). Pages one and two were to be completed anonymously. The third page contained the goals which the individual teacher had set at the September workshop.

Learner assessment included the completed Affect, Attitude, Success Matrix; the anecdotal records from January through April (earlier records were collected at the end of December); and a questionnaire (Appendix T) which asked teachers to designate the most successful strategy used with the individual learner and the difference, if any, the program had made. A form for reporting standardized test scores was also given to the teachers to complete as soon as learner scores were available (Appendix U).

Since the inservice in Cincinnati was held so late in the month, the program and learner assessment forms were mailed to the teachers on April 15th in order to give them time to complete them by the May due dates. They were instructed to bring questions to the inservice on April 24.

CONSULT READING CINCINNATI PROJECT

SOUTH AVONDALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

WORKSHOP AGENDA

February 5, 1993

8:30 - 8:50	Registration
8:50 - 9:00	Welcome and introductions
9:00 - 9:30	Background of project Consult Reading Practicum Center
9:30 - 10:00	Taxonomy and learner profiles
10:00 - 10:10	Break
10:10 - 10:40	Complete sample profiles
10:40 - 11:00	Demonstrations
11:00 - 12:30	Lunch
12:30 - 1:30	Implementation of recommendations Strategy booklet Unit Development Projects Ohio examples
1:30 - 1:45	Assessment Anecdotal record Affect, attitude, success matrix Questionnaires
1:45 - 2:00	Questions, comments

CONSULT-I® Cincinnati Project

Teacher Inservice

South Avondale Elementary School

Agenda

March 9, 1993

1. Recommendations

2. Strategies

   Focus Definitions

   Strategies booklet

   Implementation

3. Time

4. Affect, attitude, success matrix

   Definitions

   Examples

5. Anecdotal records

   Examples

   Reality check

6. Phone call schedule

7. Next inservice, April 3

8. Questions

Learner_____

Consult-I (R) Ohio Project Anecdotal Record Form

Recommendations: INT____ SC____ MOT____ FL____ LE____ SS____ G____ C____

interests, self-concept enhancement, motivation, functional language, language experience, study skills, games, comprehension

Strategy Recommendations Represented			Evaluation (+ ✓ −) of Results of Strategy	
Date	Description of Strategy			Decription of Results

Learner_____

CONSULT-I (R) READING OHIO PROJECT

AFFECT, ATTITUDE, SUCCESS MATRIX

	Affect	Attitude	Success
Beginning of year			
Middle of year			
End of year			

CONSULT-I (R) READING CINCINNATI PROJECT

SOUTH AVONDALE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

TEACHER INSERVICE

AGENDA

April 1, 1993

1. Sharing by teachers re: implementation of recommendations

2. Questions

   Anecdotal records

   Affect, attitude, success matrix

   Other

3. Art, music and writing

4. Chocolate curriculum

5. Chalkboard writing (Booster books)

6. Individual slates

7. Next inservice, May 21

8. Second entry on AAS matrix due April 15 (Send copy of matrix to Elizabeth Metz, SRC #184, 2805 East Tenth St., Bloomington, IN 47405.).

9. Telephone calls on Tuesdays, 2:30 p.m. except April 27

CONSULT-I[s] Reading Cincinnati Project

South Avondale Elementary School

May 28, 1993

Agenda

1. Sharing by teachers
2. Discussion of AAS matrices
3. Anecdotal records questions
4. Learner assessment form
5. Program assessment form
6. Due June 10
   a. Learner assessment forms
   b. AAS matrices (3rd entry)
   c. Program assessment form
   d. Anecdotal records

CONSULT-I (R) READING CINCINNATI PROJECT
PROGRAM ASSESSMENT

Please answer each question as completely as possible. Attach additional sheets of paper as necessary.

1. If you were to participate in the CONSULT-I (R) Reading project again, when would you suggest having the first workshop?

___early August ___late August ___mid September

___other (specify)

2. Identify any suggestions you have for changes in the first workshop.

a. Were the goals of the project clear? ___yes ___no

b. Were adequate explanations provided for completing

learner profiles ___yes ___no ___undecided

anecdotal records ___yes ___no ___undecided

AAS matrices ___yes ___no ___undecided

3. If you were to participate in the CONSULT-I (R) Reading project again would you prefer ___one semester or ___two semesters?

4. Did the CONSULT-I (R) Reading Project make you more aware of your learners' needs and interests? Please explain.

5. Were the CONSULT-I (R) Reading recommendations appropriate for your learners? ___yes ___no ___somewhat. Please explain.

6. Did the CONSULT-I (R) Reading recommendations assist you in focussing instruction for your learners?
___yes ___no ___somewhat. Please exnlain.

7. a. Did you implement the CONSULT-I (R) recommendations
___daily ___2/3 times a week ___weekly ___bi-weekly?

b. How much time on the average did you spend with learners and in preparation each week? Be as specific as possible.

c. How much time on the average did you spend each week in record keeping?

8. What have you done differently this semester as a result of the CONSULT-I (R) Reading project?

9. Was it ___easy ___somewhat difficult ___difficult to implement the strategy recommendations in your classroom? Please give actual examples.

	Agree				Disagree
10. The recommendations are practical for classroom use.	1	2	3	4	5
11. The support of the Reading Practicum Center staff was helpful.	1	2	3	4	5
12. The site visits/inservice were helpful.	1	2	3	4	5
13. The strategy booklet was useful.	1	2	3	4	5
14. The strategy explanations were easy to understand.	1	2	3	4	5
15. There was adequate time for strategy explanation in the workshop and inservices.	1	2	3	4	5
16. The strategy examples were easy to implement.	1	2	3	4	5

17. Are you aware of parent reactions to the CONSULT-I (R) Reading project? Please explain.

18. The best part of the CONSULT-I (R) Reading project is

19. Suggestions for CONSULT-I (R) Reading project are

20. From my experience with the CONSULT-I (R) Reading project, I learned the following:

Learner_____
Age_____

CONSULT-I (R) READING CINCINNATI PROJECT
LEARNER ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE
June 1993

Reading level February_____ June_____

Participation in other special programs_____

_____

Most effective strategy for learner (Place X before strategy.)

___Comp ___FL ___Games ___Int ___LE ___Mot ___SC ___SS

Describe use of most effective strategy._____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Results of this strategy were_____

_____

_____

Has this learner performed differently as the result of your use of CONSULT-I (R) Reading recommendations? Explain._____

_____

_____

_____

_____

To what extent did you see changes in self-concept in learner?

_____Great _____Some _____Little

Success rating as reflected in Affect, Attitude, Success Matrix.

_____High _____Medium _____Low
(See attached page for success rating discriminators.)

CONSULT-I(R) READING CINCINNATI PROJECT

SUCCESS CRITERIA

HIGH

The learner who has shown high success will have made significant progress in his/her academic achievement. For example, he/she will now be reading on a higher level than in February and/or have a higher grade in reading on the report card.

MEDIUM

The learner will have made progress in the classroom but it will not necessarily be reflected in a higher reading level or grades. It will be based on teacher observation and may include positive changes in affect and attitude.

LOW

The learner will have made little or no progress in the classroom.

CONSULT-I(R) READING CINCINNATI PROJECT

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT TABULATION

1. If you were to participate in the CONSULT-I(R) Reading project again, when would you suggest having the first workshop?

61 mid-September or October

62 mid-September

63 mid-September

64 mid-September

65 mid-September

66 mid-September

67 mid-September or beginning of second quarter

68 mid-September

2. Identify any suggestions you have for changes in the first workshop.

a. Were the goals of the project clear

yes	7 1/2
no	1/2

b. Were adequate explanations provided for completing

learner profiles

yes	7
no	1
undecided	0

anecdotal records

yes	6
no	
undecided	2

AAS matrices

yes	7
no	
undecided	1

3. If you were to participate in the CONSULT-I(R) Reading project again would you prefer

one semester 3

two semesters 5 (starting in the fall)

4. Did the CONSULT-I(R) Reading project make you more aware of your learners' needs and interests?

61 yes

62 I was able to use the information to incorporate activities in my regular lessons

63 The CONSULT-I Reading Project assisted me greatly in providing strategies that I could use to reach every child by using a wholistic approach. I became acutely aware of the learners' interests by asking each of them to write their autobiography. It came at an appropriate time because we were studying about autobiographies in our reading text. I made it a project for the entire class. After reading the autobiographies of the designated learners, through the strategies recommended I was able to get a clearer insight for each learner. I was amazed at what I learned about these designated students.

64 Yes, especially after giving the interest inventory.

65 Yes, in getting back information from the learner's profile sheet and doing certain activities helped

66 Yes, especially the interest inventory. It helped me to find motivators to help them want to learn

67 Yes, especially doing the learner profiles, interest inventories and computerized recommendations

68 Yes, I was exposed to background information that I had not know before

5. Were the CONSULT-I (R) Reading recommendations appropriate for your learners?

yes 8
no
somewhat

61 I thought I had tried everything with the students until

I used the individualized approach

62 Because I designed my lesson based on the recommendations and they proved to be diagnosed

63 Yes, because I used the various recommended strategies to reach every learner with some degree of success. This was after I discovered their interests.

64 no additional response

65 I felt that other recommendations should have been added

66 Everyone of my children's achievements increased

67 But I felt that many of the recommendations overlapped (which was great)

68 The recommendations were appropriate for my learners because that pinpointed problem areas to which I would have never known

6. Did the CONSULT-I(R) Reading recommendations assist you in focussing instruction for your learners?

yes 8
no
somewhat

61 I never considered using the child's interest as a way to gain reading skills or writing skills

62 I was able to tap into each child's area of recommendation(s). My small group activities and storytime was designed around these recommendations

63 I focused my instructions according to the interests and needs that became apparent to me through the autobiographies. What I didn't learn through the autobiographies, I learned through the All About Me profile sheets that they did later.

64 no additional response

65 It was very helpful to provide different activities in helping students to achieve academically and have a better attitude toward learning

66 The recommendations were excellent because they seemed to lead me right to the correct strategies that brought about learning

67 It really did help to gear the lessons towards their

needs

68 I was able to plan activities that would teach and interest my students at the same time

7. a. Did you implement the CONSULT-I(R) recommendations

daily	
2/3 times a week	3
weekly	3
bi-weekly	2

b. How much time on the average did you spend with learners and in preparation each week?

61 After school February 4 days a week 1 hr
March/April 3 days 1 hour after school
Also during school 1 hour

62 8 1/2 hours

63 1 1/2 hours every other day

64 30 - 60 minutes

65 one to one-half hour

66 1 hour each session

67 3-4 hours but I did schedule some of it into the day

68 an hour per week per child

c. How much time on the average did you spend each week in record keeping?

61 I needed to spend more time on records. I think I worked 15-20 minutes after each session to jot down notes. Weekends a couple of hours.

62 too much

63 approximately 45 minutes per day

64 no response

65 once a week

66 1/2 hour

67 1-2 hours

68 hour and one half

8. What have you done differently this semester as a result of the CONSULT-I(R) Reading project

61 I made booklets, made a lot of parent contacts, learned to keep better records on children having problems reading and how to help children want to read - motivation. I listened to the children longer than ever before.

62 I approached many activities based on interest rather than skill

63 I focused more on the needs of the whole child, with the intention of helping every child to feel some measure of success in reading, etc.

64 no response

65 Students achievement was built around doing activities based on their interest

66 I focussed more the interest of the child for motivation and developed plans from there

67 More dictated writing and more trade books

68 I have implemented more activities

9. Was it

easy 4
somewhat difficult 3
difficult

to implement the strategy recommendations in your classroom?

61 I have a very large class, Many students needed individual attention. Some students have tested LD. They have many problems

62 Mylon was a student I couldn't get to complete any seatwork. Once I was told that he needed to be interest oriented I used his interest for dinosaurs to get him to complete seatwork.

63 In focusing on the whole child I was able to address some of the problems by communicating some of the problems to the parents, I spent a lot of time in the area of encouragement, I coupled some stronger students with weaker students, and I used CONSULT-I strategies daily with whole groups.

64 no response

65 In knowing what the students were interested in made it easy for me to implement the strategies

66 I did all of these after school and did not have to worry about minor disturbances. As a whole class some strategies such as the given stories developed from folders and descriptive language worked very well. But many of the strategies were very individualized and only could work in small groups

67 Some strategies were easy but some were difficult. I found that it was difficult to do writing dictation in the class. I would love to have a helper to do this.

68 Other students not in program became jealous of other activities of Consult Learners

10. The recommendations are practical for classroom use

agree	1	4
	2	2
	3	1 - only 2-3 students
	4	
disagree	5	
no response		1

11. The support of the Reading Practicum Center staff was helpful

agree	1	5
	2	1
	3	1
	4	
disagree	5	
no response		1

12. The site visits/inservice were helpful

agree	1	6
	2	1
	3	
	4	
disagree	5	
no response		1

13. The strategy booklet was useful

agree	1	6
	2	1
	3	
	4	
disagree	5	
no response		1

14. The strategy explanations were easy to understand

agree	1	4
	2	2
	3	
	4	
disagree	5	
no response		2

15. There was adequate time for strategy explanation in the workshop and inservices

agree	1	4
	2	2
	3	1
	4	
disagree	5	
no response		1

16. The strategy examples were easy to implement

agree	1	5
	2	1
	3	1
	4	
disagree	5	
no response		1

17. Are you aware of parent reactions to the CONSULT-I(R) Reading project?

61 The parents became involved because I kept their children after school. Parents picked them up then we discussed our daily work and how to help at home

62 They were very cooperative helping with the taxonomy. Some would assist the students with special activities

(home)

63 Parents: indicated that they were pleased with the child's progress by visiting the classroom and expressing the noticeable difference.

64 no response

65 Yes, most parents asked for suggested things they could do with their children at home

66 Yes. The parents as a group became more involved and wanted to talk about strategies they could carry on at home

67 All of the parents were positive to the project but I only found one parent who became involved with it

68 Yes, one learner's parent was actively involved with the whole program. She was very excited about her child's program

18. The best part of the CONSULT-I(R) Reading project is

61 The strategy booklet and the interest sheet or learner profile fact sheet recommendation

62 The inventory sheets and the recommendation sheets

63 I was able to see some measure of improvement in every learner that participated, some more than others. It was a pleasure to see smiles on faces that had never been there before. It was rewarding to see children become excited about learning and reading.

64 no response

65 Being able to implement the different strategies and seeing the children show improvement in reading and other subject areas.

66 Seeing that finding the right prescription for each child and correct strategies, all children can learn

67 The focussed strategy recommendations and the positive attitudes the students gained towards reading. All of the students enjoy reading

68 The activities which are correlated according to the particular learner's background

19. Suggestions for CONSULT-I(R) Reading project are

61 During the first meeting give an overview of all the paper work needed to be completed. Make sure to mention do the paper work right away

62 Do initial orientation to program a week before school begins. Then by mid Sept. you would be able to begin implementation. Record keeping should be open (weekly, be-weekly, etc) Time period 1st-3rd quarter. Would enable you to have quality time and accurate growth data.

63 The program should begin at the beginning of the school year. The CONSULT-I should have an assistant on a part time basis to assist with the paper work, make parent contact, and help with activities preparation, and assist in grading.

64 no response

65 To cut down on the paper work, I found myself using a lot of repetition in filling out the forms and evaluation

66 no response

67 To have scheduled time during the week to do small group activities or to tie in with ESEA

68 to start at the beginning of school year and more inservices

20. From my experience with the CONSULT-I(R) Reading project I learned the following

61 I learned how to help children not interested in reading and writing gain interest. Furthermore, the nonreaders are trying to read. I learned that its important to record individual difference of children. Also keep a on going record of research on every child.

62 A child's interest plays a major role in his/her learning. Once you discover that you can build your curriculum or lessons around it. Learning also becomes fun for the child.

63 Every child no matter what level can experience some measure of success if a wholistic approach such as CONSULT-I is used on a regular basis.

64 no response

65 Many different strategies can be used to help motivate the learner show improvement in academics as well as certain behaviors

66 That there is a strategy that meets every child's needs and will help them achieve. If you find the right motivators every child can learn through his interests.

67 All students want to feel good about reading and that it really doesn't take that much time to change attitudes toward reading

68 How to prepare lessons to fit the child and how to be sympathetic with students who need extra special help